A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch

'All Nations Shall be Blessed'

DANIEL C. OLSON

STUDIA IN VETERIS TESTAMENTI PSEUDEPIGRAPHA 24

BRILL

A New Reading of the *Animal Apocalypse* of 1 Enoch

With a New Translation and Commentary

Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha

Series Editors

Henk Jan de Jonge, Jean-Claude Haelewyck
Johannes Magliano-Tromp, Pierluigi Piovanelli

VOLUME 24

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/svtp

A New Reading of the *Animal Apocalypse* of 1 Enoch

"All Nations Shall be Blessed"

With a New Translation and Commentary

By
Daniel C. Olson

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2013

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Olson, Daniel C. (Daniel Carl), 1955-
A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch : "All Nations Shall be Blessed" / With a New Translation and Commentary By Daniel C. Olson.
pages cm. – (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha ; Volume 24)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-24530-3 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-24778-9 (e-book) 1. Ethiopic book of Enoch LXXXV-XC–Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Apocalyptic literature–History and criticism. 3. Animals–Symbolic aspects. 4. Animals–Religious aspects–Judaism. 5. Bible. O.T.–History of Biblical events. 6. Jews–History–To 70 A.D. I. Ethiopic book of Enoch LXXXV-XC. English. Olson. 2013. II. Title.

BS1830.E7O47 2013
229'.913–dc23

2012049301

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-8125
ISBN 978-90-04-24530-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-24778-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ix
List of Abbreviations xi

Introduction 1
1 The *Animal Apocalypse* as Allegory 2
2 Unresolved Questions about the *Animal Apocalypse* 3
3 History and Theology in the *Animal Apocalypse*: Recent Scholarship 5
4 The Present Study 13
5 Thesis 14

PART ONE

THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* AND THE OFFSPRING OF ABRAHAM

I Looking at the Future: The Scope and the Focus of the Allegory .. 19
1 Is the Scope of the Allegory Particular or Universal? 19
2 The Focus of the Allegory: Eschatological Transformation 22
a The *nagar* of *1En* 90:38 22
b Who Is the White Bull? 26
3 The Enoch Tradition and the Abrahamic Covenant 31
4 Jacob and the Enochic Tradition 37
a Jacob, Enoch, and the "Book of the Watchers" (*1En* 1–36) ... 37
b Jacob, Enoch, and the "Astronomy Book" (*1En* 72–82) 42
c Jacob, Enoch, and the "Admonitions of Enoch" (*1En* 91–105) 44
d Jacob, Enoch, and the "Parables of Enoch" (*1En* 37–71) 45
e Preliminary Conclusions, with a Caution 50
5 Jacob, Enoch, and the *Animal Apocalypse* 52

II Looking at the Past: The Uses of History in the Allegory 57
1 Is There "History" between the Two Jacobs? 57
2 Qualifying for the Blessing 61
3 "Open Eyes": Seeing the Glory of God 66
4 Enoch and Jacob: Seers of the Glory 72

5 Color and Location 76
a Black versus White 76
b Straying versus Staying-Returning 78
6 The Three Dynamics 81
7 Conclusions 83

III Looking at the Present: The Allegory in Its Own Historical Context 85
1 Why Support the Revolt? 87
2 Suiting the Allegory to Service as Propaganda 90
a The Sin of Fratricide 90
b The Strengths and Limitations of Leadership 91
c The Diplomatic Touch 92
3 Establishing a Two-Fold Authority 97
a The Authority of Enoch 97
b The Authority of Scripture and History 98
4 Predicting the End 107
5 The Evidence of the *Book of Jubilees* 108
6 Conclusions 110

PART TWO

THE ANIMAL APOCALYPSE (*1EN* 85:2–90:42)
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

IV The Text of the *Animal Apocalypse* 115

V Identifications of the Wild Animals in the *Animal Apocalypse* 121
1 The Animals in *1En* 89:10–11: Species 121
2 The Animals in *1En* 89:10–11: Ethnic/Political Identity 129
a "The Beasts of the Field" 130
b "The Birds of the Sky" 136

VI Genesis through Kings (*1Enoch* 85:2–89:58) Translation and Commentary 145
85:2–10: The First Generations of Humanity 145
86:1–87:1: The Fall of the Watchers and the Birth of the Giants 150
87:2–89:1: The Seven Archangels and the First Judgment 155
89:2–9: The Flood 159
89:10–14: Noah to Joseph 163

89:15–27: Moses and the Exodus 168
89:28–40: From the Exodus to the Settlement in the Land 173
89:41–50: From the Judges to Solomon 177
89:51–58: The Period of the Divided Kingdom..... 183

VII Exile to the Eschaton (*1Enoch* 89:59–90:42) Translation and Commentary 189
89:59–64: The Seventy Shepherds..... 189
89:65–72a: The First Period: The Babylonian Era..... 192
89:72b–90:1: The Second Period: The Persian Era 195
90:2–5: The Third Period: The Macedonian-Ptolemaic Era..... 201
90:6–12: The Fourth Period: The Seleucid Era 208
90:13–19: The Final War 215
90:20–27: The Last Judgment..... 221
90:28–36: The New Jerusalem 225
90:37–39: The New Humanity 228
90:40–42: Epilogue 230

PART THREE

THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* AND THE ONGOING CONVERSATION

VIII The *Animal Apocalypse* in Dialogue..... 235
1 Looking at the Past: The "Wisdom" Approach to History..... 235
2 Looking at the Present: The Jewish-Hellenistic Encounter and the Maccabean Revolt 238
3 Looking to the Future: The Eschatology of the *Animal Apocalypse* and the Apostle Paul 242
4 Conclusions 243

Appendix: Allusions to the *Animal Apocalypse* in the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah*..... 245
1 *The Epistle of Barnabas* 245
2 The Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* 252
3 Conclusions 256

Bibliography 257
Index of Modern Authors..... 275
Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings..... 278
Subject Index 291

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the members of my dissertation committee, LeAnn Snow Flesher, Erich Gruen, Loren Stuckenbruck, and especially my committee coordinator John C. Endres, S.J., for their invaluable advice and encouragement. I owe a debt of gratitude to Patrick Tiller for his fine work, with which I am in dialogue throughout this book, and to Abuna Melchesedek, who taught me much about Ethiopic. Most of all I thank my wife Laurie for her constant love and support. *Soli Deo gloria*.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of journal titles and of series are not included as these are fully expanded in the bibliographic listing of the works cited. Abbreviations of ancient documents follow the standard conventions as set forth in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. Patrick H. Alexander et al.; Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1999).

ABD	*The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. Freedman)
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (ed. Pritchard)
APAT	*Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. Kautzsch)
APOT	*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. Charles)
BDB	*Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. Brown, Driver and Briggs)
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. Elliger and Rudolph)
COS	*The Context of Scripture* (ed. Hallo)
CTA	*Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à RaShamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939* (ed. Herder)
DCH	*Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (ed. Clines)
EMML	*Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library*
FGH	*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (ed. Jacoby)
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. Koehler and Baumgartner)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	*Greek-English Lexicon* (ed. Liddell, Scott, Jones, and McKenzie)
OTP	*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. Charlesworth)

INTRODUCTION

The "Animal Apocalypse" (*1En* 85–90; henceforth *An. Apoc.*) is one of the names most commonly given to an allegorical summary of history, from Adam to the eschatological kingdom of God, presented in the form of a dream vision granted to the biblical patriarch Enoch in the seventh generation from Adam. It was written by a Jew[1] during the opening years of the Maccabean revolt, and within the corpus known as *1Enoch* it is the second and larger of two works that together comprise a section known as the "Dream Visions" (*1En* 83–90). In the allegory, humanity is depicted under the symbolism of various species of animals, hence the name. The animal imagery goes through several stages. Humanity is uniformly depicted as cattle until the Flood, although these come in three colors: white, black, and red, standing for elect, non-elect, and neutral humanity. After the Flood, a variety of predatory and unclean animals are born, representing the Gentile nations, while Abraham and Isaac are still white bulls. Beginning with Jacob, however, the people of Israel are depicted as a flock of sheep. In addition to the menagerie of humanity, the divine and the angelic realms are also depicted in the allegory. Good angels in the allegory are depicted as white men, while evil angels are stars in the era before the Deluge, and shepherds during the current era. Curiously, God is neither mentioned nor depicted until the time of the exodus, but once he appears, he is consistently referred to as "the Lord of the flock."

For the period from the rise of Babylon until the author's own day, the allegory introduces an elaborate historical framework involving the divine abandonment of Israel to the rule of seventy wicked angels, who reign for fixed, pre-ordained time periods. This program makes it clear that during the Babylonian, Persian, and early Hellenistic periods, God refuses to intervene in history. The end of the seventy periods lies in the real author's future, and *vaticinia ex eventu* turns to authentic prophecy at this point. God steps onto the scene, presiding over a final judgment of angels and humans. Afterwards,

[1] I have decided to refer to the author with male pronouns in this study, because it seems very unlikely to me that a woman of that time and place would have had the opportunity to acquire the education and scribal skills demonstrated by the author, as regrettable as that historical circumstance may be.

a New Jerusalem is constructed, and all the wild beasts and birds (the Gentiles) submit to the flock of sheep (Israel). Finally, another white bull is born, the first since Abraham and Isaac. Although the relevant passage is not without difficulties, it seems that all of humanity submits to the rule of this white bull and is then transformed, *en masse*, into white cattle. Thus the allegory ends much like it began, with all of humanity depicted as white cattle, with the improvement that in this final age no black or red cattle are born.

1. *The* Animal Apocalypse *as Allegory*

According to Patrick Tiller, "[i]t can be shown that all known (and published) readers of the *An. Apoc*. have … read it allegorically."[2] Tiller is correct. There is indeed no dispute that this work is an allegory presented in an apocalyptic framework, but an allegory of what kind? Northrop Frye defines the genre:

> We have allegory when the events of a narrative obviously and continuously refer to another simultaneous structure of events or ideas, whether historical events, moral or philosophical ideas, or natural phenomena.[3]

The narration for approximately the first two-thirds of the *An. Apoc*. plainly mirrors another "structure of … historical events," the narrative portions of Genesis–Kings. In the vast majority of cases, the biblically literate reader has no difficulty matching the animal symbols and the events to their biblical counterparts, and the symbols appear to be used consistently. Such one-to-one allegory was not unknown in antiquity. For example, those parables of Jesus that are followed by interpretations often pair up two narratives and then run down a string of one-to-one correspondences between all of the major details in each. The story of a sower who gets mixed results from his scattered seed is compared to a preacher who gets mixed results from his preaching (Matt 13:3–23). A description of fishermen hauling in a catch and then separating good fish from bad is compared to angels gathering up human souls at the end of the age, followed by a judgment (Matt 13:47–50). Every element in each story matches an element in its allegorical twin.

---

[2] Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 22.

[3] Northrop Frye, "Allegory," in *The Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (ed. Alex Preminger; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 12–15 (12).

It might be asked if we can be confident that the author of the *An. Apoc.* carries on with scrupulous one-to-one correspondences to historical characters and events once the allegory passes the biblical period and enters a period without a clear parallel narrative to use for comparison. There are positive and negative reasons to think that he does. Positively, no modern commentator on *1Enoch* has had any difficulty finding reasonable correspondences between elements in the narrative of 90:8–12 and the early stages of the Maccabean revolt as it is known from 1–2 Maccabees. Negatively, it may be noted that the allegory makes very few historical claims for the Persian and early Hellenistic periods.[4] This barrenness matches the ignorance about those eras that we find in other ancient sources—and indeed, those eras remain obscure even today. The allegorist could easily have filled out the skimpy narrative at these points with free invention, and few readers, if any, would have been well-positioned to detect the cheat. Nevertheless, the author does not take that option. He appears to have stuck to what he knew.

In short, there is no reason to think the allegorist changes his method once the biblical narrative runs dry. We know little about what sources of information would have been available to him, but it would be presumptuous to assume that he had none, especially since we have the evidence of Daniel 11 that an exact contemporary was familiar with Greek historical writings.

2. *Unresolved Questions about the* Animal Apocalypse

Theology and history are not separable in this allegorical apocalypse. Since the work provides a survey of events from Adam to the Eschaton, it is by definition a historiographical work, even if in the form of allegory, but it is also agreed on all sides that the overriding subject of the *An. Apoc.* is the outworking of God's plans for his creation. It is a story of sin and salvation.[5]

---

[4] In the *Commentary* on 89:74–90:5 in Part Two, I argue that the allegory makes only one clear, specific historical claim for the Persian period after the Temple is rebuilt, and only one for the Ptolemaic period.

[5] Writing theology and history at the same time hardly makes the *An. Apoc.* unique, of course. From the Torah and the Former Prophets to 1–2 Chronicles, it is clear that rehearsals of the past were a characteristic way of articulating theology in ancient Judaism, and this is equally true for the many briefer résumés, whether within the canon (e.g., Josh 24:2–13; Nehemiah 9; Pss 78, 105, 106, 136) or beyond (e.g., *1En* 91–93; Judith 5; *2Bar.* 36–40; 53–74; *4Ezra* 14:11–39; *T. Mos.* 2–10). One of the better treatments of this topic is a 1975 Harvard

Beyond this broad consensus, however, there is disagreement about even the most fundamental issues. Among such issues, I would draw attention especially to these:

1) *The scope and focus of the allegory*. Is the salvation of the nation of Israel the central concern, or is the real subject of the *An. Apoc*. humanity in general?
2) *The relationship between human history and divine salvation*. Does the *An. Apoc*. champion one or more traditions within Israel's history as the main avenue for the working out of God's salvific plans, or does the allegory abandon traditional articulations of *Heilsgeschichte*? What role, if any, do the Abrahamic or Mosaic covenants, or the Davidic throne, or the prophets, or the Temple, play in the story of salvation?
3) *The basis for moral responsibility*. Are humans (a) free moral agents, (b) creatures who act according to predetermined fate, or (c) some kind of third option? And what implication does this question have for a right standing with God in the allegory?

These are indeed fundamental questions. They could be rephrased as, "What is the basic subject of this text?" "What does the text say about that subject?" and "What does the text say about the human condition, and therefore about its conversation partner, the reader?" There are reasons why all of these remain points of contention. With regard to the first consideration, the allegory appears to end by abolishing all nationalism, including the nation of Israel and the Jew-vs.-Gentile distinction. And yet the overwhelming bulk of the allegory is given over to a rehearsal of the history of Israel. How may this be explained? With regard to the second issue, the allegory features positive portrayals of Moses and Aaron, David and the united kingdom, and the Jerusalem Temple, but scholars have been unable to demonstrate persuasively that any of these (or some other possible locus for Jewish identity) provides a key to history in the allegory or the basis for its ideal future. One is left with the question, what is the history of Israel for? What are we supposed to find there? With regard to the third issue, the allegory develops a rich vocabulary for describing human moral behavior and ultimate standing before God, including (1) color coding, (2) descriptions of episodes involving straying and returning to the proper path or place, and (3) frequent references to blindness and seeing—usually but not exclusively with regard

---

University seminar paper given by Carol Newsom, unfortunately not published: "Enoch 83–90: The Historical Résumé as Biblical Exegesis."

to the flock of sheep. Depending on the chosen point of emphasis and the interpretations given to these three, various scholars have been able to build cases for both strict determinism and absolute moral freedom in their readings of the *An. Apoc.*'s moral anthropology.

The present study will deal with these issues. In addition, there is another dimension of the *An. Apoc.* that cannot be ignored if the work is going to be understood within its historical context, and that is its purpose as propaganda. The apocalypse was written during tumultuous times. The famous persecution unleashed against the Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes was a recent memory, and the Maccabean revolt was well underway. The *An. Apoc.* was probably written about 165 BCE and then updated in mid-161, following the battle of Adasa in March (1Macc 7:39–50; 2Macc 15:15–17). Judas Maccabee was still alive and leading the revolt, and he had scored a string of significant military victories against Seleucid forces by this point. The Temple had been reclaimed and cleansed. Momentum was clearly running in Judas's favor, and the *An. Apoc.* threw its support to the effort, seeing the earthly inauguration of the kingdom of God at the end of the process then underway. Scholars have debated whether the author of the *An. Apoc.* was one of the Hasidim (1Macc 2:42; 7:12–14; 2Macc 14:6), but oddly enough, there has been virtually no discussion about how the allegory's presumptive role as propaganda for the Maccabean revolt might color its historiography or its theology *all the way through the narrative*, as opposed to affecting only the portion covering the contemporary scene. The present study will take this dimension into consideration as well.

3. *History and Theology in the* Animal Apocalypse*: Recent Scholarship*

There are a number of works in recent scholarship that have addressed the questions under review, and most of them present challenges to the conclusions of the present study, and those challenges come from a variety of angles. The place to begin is Patrick A. Tiller's *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), the only full-scale commentary dedicated exclusively to the *An. Apoc.*[6] Tiller's book

[6] Tiller's book bills itself as an "exegetical commentary," and it succeeds on that level as a verse-by-verse, and section-by-section, historical-critical study. However, Tiller's treatment of the ideology of the *An. Apoc.* and the understanding of history implied within this work are comparatively light and sporadic, amounting to a total of less than twenty pages. Tiller, *A Commentary*, 17–20, 47–51, 116–126.

provides a good survey of scholarship on the *An. Apoc*. up until about 1990,[7] as well as a full bibliography,[8] so it provides a convenient point of departure for a survey of recent scholarship.

Tiller deals with all three of the basic areas of inquiry enumerated earlier. He sees the *An. Apoc*. as universal rather than Judeocentric. All animals eventually become white cattle (90:37–38), and the new age is a world without nationalities and conflicts, as all of humanity is returned to "a single Adamic race."[9] With regard to the relationship between history and salvation, Tiller believes that the author of the apocalypse views human history "as an account of progressive deterioration, with evil and violence (both human and demonic) progressively increasing."[10] Since there are three ages, each beginning with a white bull (Adam, Noah, and the white bull of 90:37–38), Noah represents the *only* fresh start for humanity between the original creation and the eschatological age, but like Adam, Noah has offspring of mixed color, and history quickly takes a downward turn once again. Only the intervention of God stops the slide, bringing judgment and inaugurating a final and permanent "third age" free from the defects that doomed the antediluvian and postdiluvian ages. In short, God does

---

[7] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 4–13. Previous to Tiller, 19th-century scholarship on *1 Enoch* had already been surveyed many times. See George H. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch: Translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes* (Andover: Draper, 1882), 19–26; François Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1906), lxii–lxxiii; R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), xxvii–xlvi.

[8] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 393–402. The only significant omission that I can find is Bo Reicke, "Official and Pietistic Elements of Jewish Apocalypticism," *JBL* 79 (1960), 137–150. Reicke argues that the *An. Apoc*. runs counter to usual expectations about "apocalypticism" in that it takes a pro-establishment ("official") rather than an anti-establishment ("pietistic") stance (pp. 139–143). Reicke's identification of the "horned ram" of *1 En* 90:9 as the Hasmonean ruler John Hyrcanus may be the last serious attempt to defend this interpretation, which has been abandoned since the publication of the Qumran fragments of the *An. Apoc*.

[9] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 20. The radical quality of this anti-nationalistic universalism seems to have made a deeper and deeper impression on Tiller over the years. In his original dissertation, he wrote: "The theological implications of this are a bit surprising. The existence of the nation Israel is seen a one of the negative effects of human history that the ideal future will undo" (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch 85–90*) (*Volumes I and II*) [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1991] 1:24). When the dissertation was published, "a bit surprising" had become "quite surprising" (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* [SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993], 20). By 2005, precisely this aspect of the apocalypse makes the *An. Apoc*. "an extremely radical document" ("Israel at the Mercy of Demonic Powers: An Enochic Interpretation of Postexilic Imperialism," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* [ed. B.J. Wright III and L.M. Wills; SBLSymS 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005], 113–121 [120]).

[10] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 18.

not bring salvation through human history: he puts a stop to human history before all is lost.

With regard to moral responsibility, Tiller finds that among the people of God (the flock of sheep), the main sin is apostasy, and Tiller notes that the *An. Apoc*. has two ways of depicting it: (1) straying away from the proper pasturage, especially the "house" (Jerusalem) and "tower" (Temple) once these institutions are established; and (2) blindness.[11] It is taken for granted that angels and people are morally responsibility for their actions, since they are judged based upon their behavior.

Two *1Enoch* commentaries have appeared since Tiller's book, both of them in conversation with Tiller.[12] George Nickelsburg's commentary gives more explicit attention to matters of theology than Tiller's, but in the end his analysis is quite similar. In broad terms, the allegory shows that the triumph of God's rule on earth is inevitable, making the *An. Apoc*. a "major work of theodicy" with a universal sweep that includes all of humanity, not just Israel.[13] Nickelsburg does not identify any particular avenue through which this triumph comes about. Instead, he identifies as the central theme of the apocalypse "the story of how God deals with the human predicament," and this predicament Nickelsburg identifies as "the presence of sin." Some of this sin is human. The sins of the Gentiles are violence and oppression, while the sins of Israel are cultic, and in deuteronomic fashion Israel's sin is depicted, judged, and punished in the historical survey. Israel's cultic sins are caused by blindness, but at the same time they wander from the path that God has shown them, so they are morally responsible agents. Nevertheless, in the end it is not human but *angelic* sin that is the larger problem, both in

---

[11] Ibid., 318.

[12] George W.E. Nickelsburg *1Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); Daniel C. Olson, in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh, *Enoch, A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1Enoch, Translated with Annotations and Cross-References* (North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 2004). Nickelsburg made available to Tiller a pre-publication draft of his commentary, and Tiller makes extensive reference to it throughout his book (Tiller, *A Commentary*, xi). When Nickelsburg's commentary eventually appeared in 2001, he acknowledged in turn his own indebtedness to Tiller's work, stating that he and Tiller were in substantial agreement, disagreeing primarily over the date of the *An. Apoc*. and its redaction (Nickelsburg, *1Enoch*, 354 n. 1). In a similar fashion, I carried on correspondence with Tiller while he was re-editing his dissertation into what became the published commentary (Tiller, *A Commentary*, xii). My own *1Enoch* commentary, largely written in the 1990's but not published until 2004, owes much to Tiller in its treatment of the *An. Apoc*, although my notes are much briefer than Nickelsburg's and intended for a more general audience.

[13] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 357.

the primordial past (i.e., the Watchers who co-mingled with women before the Flood; cf. Gen 6:1–4; *1En* 6–9), and in the latter days (i.e., the angelic shepherds misruling Israel since the time of Manasseh; cf. *1En* 89:59–90:19).[14] Nickelsburg even suggests that demonic agencies may be at work in parts of the allegory where they are not explicitly mentioned.[15] Thus, the arena of human history and human moral responsibility is only part of the story. The angelic realm impinges upon it and overrules human initiative to at least some degree.

Olson's commentary puts particular stress on the allegory's universalism, emphasizing that the *An. Apoc.* ends with the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Gentile, a surprising stance for a Jewish author writing in the beginning years of the Maccabean revolt and a supporter of Judas.[16]

Besides these two *1Enoch* commentaries, there has been three major monographs on the *An. Apoc.* published since Tiller's book. The first seven chapters of David Bryan's *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality* (JSPSS 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995) are devoted to the *An. Apoc.* Drawing on the theories of Mary Douglas,[17] Bryan argues that the key to understanding the *An. Apoc.* is the world-view implied in the priestly, "kosher mentality," which sharply divides clean from unclean and sees the mixture and confusion of distinct kinds as a threat to the creation, an invasion of God's orderly cosmos by primordial chaos. Behind the ebbs and flows of history stands a titanic, mythical struggle between Chaos and Order. That being so, the choice of clean and unclean animals in the *An. Apoc.* to represent, respectively, God's chosen people and the hostile heathen is not a matter of neutral allegorical symbolism but central to understanding the spiritual significance of history as understood in the *An. Apoc.*[18]

---

[14] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 355–356. For the underlying deuteronomic theology, see esp. p. 359.

[15] Ibid., 356, 371, 380–381.

[16] Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 16. As I have rethought many issues since this book was published, I will be referring to its author in the third person throughout, "Olson," the man with the opinions I held then, but not necessarily now.

[17] Especially her influential work, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).

[18] Bryan provides helpful summaries and conclusions (*Cosmos*, 183–184, 249–252). His work underscores the care that went into the author's choice of symbols, and his studies of the individual animals are full of useful insights, but his main thesis is not compelling. If the priestly, "kosher mentality" was so central to the author's world, why are there no examples of dietary transgressions, for example, in the allegory's recounting of Israel's sin? Could the choice of clean animals for Jews and unclean for Gentiles be a simple artistic choice, picking symbols with positive connotations on the one hand and symbols that inspire

One might expect Bryan's thesis to lead most naturally to salvation for the "clean" Jews as exemplars of Order and damnation for the "unclean" Gentiles as exemplars of Chaos. Instead, we find in Bryan another scholar who sees salvation for both Jews and Gentiles in the end. He accepts without debate that 90:37–38 depicts a transformation of all species into white cattle, and he does not explain how this fits into his larger thesis.[19]

The second of the three major monographs is actually an older work: Günter Reese, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentems: eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äethiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches* (BBB 123; Berlin: Philo, 1999). This is Reese's 1967 University of Heidelberg dissertation, published more than 30 years later without alteration or updating. Tiller's treatment of Reese's work is rather brief and dismissive,[20] but Reese's discussion of the *An. Apoc.* has been singularly influential in German scholarship.[21]

Reese takes issue with the notion that apocalypticism represents a despair of finding God's activity within the arena of human history—a loss of faith in the program of *Heilsgeschichte*.[22] Reese argues that, to the contrary,

---

repugnance and ridicule on the other? Rather than intimating a vast, mythical, priestly view of the cosmos, the author could be drawing on deep-seated cultural associations operative within everyday Jewish life, such as a pervasive disgust for pigs and dogs and a high regard for flocks and herds. In texts like Isa 65:4 and 66:3, a certain revulsion for pigs and dogs is indeed blended with notions of Levitical cleanliness, but in texts where these animals symbolize Israel's enemies, like Pss 22:16; 59:6, 14; and 80:13, they seem more calculated to repel the reader simply because they have come to be regarded as repugnant beasts.

[19] Ibid., 62, 183.

[20] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 10.

[21] Simply as a matter of justice it is a good thing to see this work published, since a number of Reese's original ideas have entered the secondary literature of the *An. Apoc.* without adequate attribution. For example: (1) noting the parallels between certain Flood traditions in cuneiform sources and in the *An. Apoc.*, (2) proposing a 23–12–23–12 structure for the four ages of the angel-shepherds in the *An. Apoc.*, and (3) proposing to emend "sheep of the fields" to "beasts of the fields" in *1En* 90:16 are all Reese's ideas (*Die Geschichte*, 23 n. 49; 35 n. 112; 40 n. 141), but they have been mistakenly credited to Olson, Martin Hengel, and Tiller, respectively (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 263–264, 337–338, 363–364; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 389). Philip Tite's study of the relationship between the two dream visions of *1En* 83–90 shows no awareness of Reese's discussion of the topic. See P.L. Tite, "Textual and Redactional Aspects of the Book of Dreams (1Enoch 83–90)," *BTB* 31/3 (2001), 106–120 (p. 106: "Little work, to my knowledge, has been devoted to ascertaining the role of the redactor in bringing these two Enochian traditions together"); but see Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 15–17.

[22] Reese is taking up cudgels against influential scholars like Gerhard Von Rad, who famously spoke of apocalypticism at one point as a "soteriological draining" (*soteriologischen Entleerung*) of history (G. Von Rad, *Weisheit in Israel* [Gütersloh: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970], 350).

the approach of the *An. Apoc.* is hardly different from classical Israelite prophecy in that it stresses the need for obedience, and it sees God acting entirely through human history to bring salvation to Israel, with no elements of fatalism or determinism.[23] In order to support his strong claims for the *An. Apoc.*'s exclusive interest in Israel and Israel alone, Reese must dismiss 90:37–38 as an interpolation.[24] As we will presently see, subsequent scholarship has generally found Reese's views on the *An. Apoc.* too extreme.

The third sizable study of the *An. Apoc.* since Tiller is Daniel Assefa's *L'Apocalypse des animaux* (*1Hen 85–90*)*: une propagande militaire? Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques* (SupJSJ 120; Leiden: Brill, 2007). Like Tiller, Nickelsburg, and Olson, Assefa stresses the universal sweep of the historical *denouement* in the *An. Apoc.*[25] Despite this universal scope, the allegory does not concern itself with moral responsibility as a general human problem, according to Assefa, but only with regard to Israel's infidelity to Law and Covenant. Thus, at the great assize, judgment falls on wicked angels and on blinded sheep (faithless Israelites), but not on anyone else.[26] Repentance and obedience to the Law of Moses are the pathway to Israel's salvation. It is taken for granted throughout that humans are responsible moral agents capable of reform as well as apostasy.[27]

Other, shorter, but significant discussions of the *An. Apoc.* have also appeared in the years since Tiller's book. Beato Ego's essay, "Vergangenheit im Horizont eschatologischer Hoffnung: Die Tiervision (1Hen 85–90) als Beispiel apolkalyptischer Geschichtskonzeption," pages 171–195 in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (ed. Eve-Marie Becker; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), is in many ways a response to the extremism of Reese. Ego agrees with Reese that the primary focus of the *An. Apoc.* is Israel's history, not universal history,[28] but he argues that the course of history as depicted in the *An. Apoc.* is highly ambivalent,

---

[23] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 48–49.

[24] Ibid., 42–43.

[25] Assefa, *L'Apocalypse*, 320.

[26] Ibid., 289.

[27] In my view, Assefa's analysis of the *An. Apoc.* glosses over conflicting data within the allegory in its attempt to paint the work in pacifistic colors. For example, Assefa is adamant that the occupying powers have nothing whatsoever to do with the "blindness" of Israel (*L'Apocalypse*, 289), but cf. 90:2, where the birds blind the sheep; Assefa believes the "horns" of 90:9–16 signify God's divine protection rather than military might (ibid., 318, 324), but horns elsewhere in the allegory are lethal weapons (86:5) and signify military prowess (89:43); Assefa maintains that militarism is foreign to the theology of the *An. Apoc.* (ibid., 320), and yet David as king is remembered almost exclusively for his military successes (89:48–49).

[28] Ego, "Vergangenheit," 181–186.

with a mixture of angelic and human sin interacting with God's purposes, making the Eschaton both continuous and discontinuous with historical developments on the human plane.[29]

Another post-Tiller study goes to the opposite extreme of Reese. Gabriele Boccaccini compares and contrasts the *An. Apoc*. and Daniel in chapter four of his book, *Middle Judaism*,[30] arguing, like Nickelsburg and Tiller, that the *An. Apoc*. depicts history as a continuous expansion of evil, but in Boccaccini's view this evil is emphatically the fault of the angels. Indeed, it stems from the sexual transgression of the Watchers, and through sexual union it continues to be transmitted from generation to generation.[31] Humanity is cast in the role of victim, with only limited freedom and limited moral responsibility, to the point where the concept of covenant is effectively abandoned. Those whom God has elected for salvation are reduced in Enoch's vision to waiting for the nightmare to end through divine intervention.[32]

In vivid contrast, Philip L. Tite sees the element of human freedom and moral responsibility so strongly affirmed in the *An. Apoc*. that a later editor added to it the first dream vision (*1En* 83–84), precisely in order to add a stronger note of historical determinism to the whole.[33] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, in a briefer study, also argues that the *An. Apoc*. affirms human moral responsibility, even within admittedly evil times, and this lends real significance to the "unfolding of time" as a test of human faithfulness.[34]

Certain selected aspects of the *An. Apoc*. have also received significant treatments in the years since Tiller's book. One of these is the four time periods described in 89:59–90:19, the era of the "70 shepherds." At issue is whether this system is more a product of theology or of historiography. In an ambitious study of all heptadically-structured models of Jewish history from the Second Temple period, Christoph Berner surveys the *An. Apoc*. and notes that it shows no interest in dates or chronology outside the period of the 70

---

[29] Idem, 189–190.

[30] G. Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 126–160.

[31] Ibid., 132, 136.

[32] Ibid., 149, 155–156.

[33] "Textual and Redactional Aspects of the Book of Dreams (1Enoch 83–90)," *BTB* 31/3 (2001), 106–120.

[34] L.T. Stuckenbruck, "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (1Enoch 85–90)," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 91–102.

shepherds/four empires.[35] He suggests, therefore, that the 12-23-23-12 pattern of this section is dictated entirely by the author's theological interests and has little to do with chronology.[36] In sharp contrast, Olson argues in a 2005 article that the chronology of the four kingdoms in the latter part of the allegory corresponds well to significant historical events, a position similar to that of Devorah Dimant.[37]

The troublesome but crucial text 90:37–38 has received further review as well. Karlheinz Müller has turned Reese's brief dismissal of 90:37–38 as a later interpolation into a more fully-developed argument. He contends in his *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apokalyptik* that between the direct actions of God on the one hand (90:18), and the victories of the armed sheep on the other (90:19), the Hasidean theology of the original apocalypse had no place for a messiah, and the unexpected appearance of the white bull in 90:37–38 is an interpolation from a later time, when disappointment with Hasmonean tyranny awakened desire for further deliverance, and a glossator was inspired to add a messiah figure to the *An. Apoc.*[38] Müller's arguments have largely convinced Andreas Bedenbender, who incorporates them into his own analysis of the ending of the *An. Apoc.* Bedenbender sees in the eschatological white bull an odd combination of Second Adam and political messiah (noting the emphasis on the horns), a calculated attempt to make the *An. Apoc.* acceptable to Jewish groups with disparate ideologies.[39] Arriving at a somewhat similar conclusion, but from a radically different point of view, is Daniel Assefa. Drawing on Ethiopian reading tradition, Daniel Assefa argues that, first of all, the *nagar* in 90:38b

---

[35] Christoph Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubliäen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 169–226.

[36] Ibid. 222–226. Specifically, Berner argues that the 70 year-weeks come from Jer 25:12, just like other heptadically-structured historical surveys such as Daniel 9 and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17). The twice-12 in the *An. Apoc.* probably symbolizes double punishment on the twelve tribes of Israel, while the twice-23 is punishment for ignoring the 23 years of Jeremiah's preaching (see Jer 25:3).

[37] Daniel C. Olson, "Historical Chronology after the Exile according to 1 Enoch 89–90," *JSP* 15/1 (2005), 63–74. Devorah Dimant has published her views on the chronology several times. For a conveniently available English version, see "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT 2.2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 544–545.

[38] Karlheinz Müller, *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apocalyptik* (SBAB 11; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991), 164–166.

[39] A. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokcalyptik* (ANTZ 8; Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000), 208–211.

should be distinguished from the "white bull" of 90:37–38a, and that secondly, 90:38b (along with 90:31) may be a later interpolation in order to incorporate an Antichrist conflict into the end of the allegory.[40] The studies of Reese, Müller, Bedenbender, and Assefa have in common the suggestion that 90:37–38, in whole or in part, represents an addition to the original booklet. The problems affecting all of them are (1) the lack of any manuscript evidence for interference at this point and (2) the fact that most scholars think that satisfactory explanations for the passage as an integral part of the apocalypse have been offered, leaving any theory of interpolation with a heavy burden of proof. In a more text-based study, David C. Mitchell argues unpersuasively that 90:37–38 is based on Deut 33:17 and refers to the Messiah ben Joseph known from later rabbinic sources.[41] Meanwhile, Tiller has signaled that he now accepts Nickelsburg's explanation of the textual corruption in 90:38, in which the eschatological white bull apparently becomes a *nagar* ("word," "thing"). Nickelsburg's solution to this famous crux is that Aramaic דבר ("leader") was read as if it were Hebrew ("word").[42]

4. *The Present Study*

In light of the disagreements over even basic issues, I believe that the *An. Apoc*. might benefit from a fresh examination of its ideology and objectives. To do this, I will organize the most disputed issues into three temporal categories, dealt with in three chapters. Firstly, it may be noted that questions

---

[40] D. Assefa, "The Enigmatic End of the Animal Apocalypse in the Light of Traditional Ethiopian Commentary," in *Proceedings of the XVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies* (ed. S. Uhlig; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 552–560; also Assefa, *L'Apocalypse*, 235, 304–317.

[41] David C. Mitchell, "Firstborn *Shor* and *Rem*: A Sacrificial Josephite Messiah in *1Enoch* 90.37–38 and Deuteronomy 33.17," *JSP* 15/3 (2006), 211–228. The problems with Mitchell's argument are numerous. Beside the lateness of any other witness to the Messiah ben Joseph (admitted by Mitchell on pp. 226–227), his zoological data are erroneous (p. 216; the horns of the aurochs were not black and did not stick straight up), and he glosses over the fact that the sequence of events he finds in *1En* 90:37–38 is precisely the reverse of the sequence he finds in Deut 33:17 (p. 224; universal rule *precedes* the transformation from *shor* to *rem* in Mitchell's reading of *1En* 90:37–38, but it *follows* that same transformation in Deut 33:17).

[42] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 403. Tiller was skeptical in his *Commentary* (pp. 386–388), but has since changed his mind: "George Nickelsburg's '1Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1Enoch: Chapters 1–36; 81–108,'" in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck; JSJSup 80: Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2. 367.

about the allegory's scope and focus are matters that pertain to the *future*. The apocalypse points to what will happen in the end. A sound translation and interpretation of the troublesome text of 90:37–38 will prove to be crucial here. I will seek to explain this passage within the context of the Enochic tradition in general and the *An. Apoc.* in particular, where it represents a bold understanding of the Abrahamic promises in Genesis.

Secondly, examining the *past* as it is depicted in the *An. Apoc.* reveals a subtle relationship between history and salvation. The bulk of past history is given over to illuminating the paradoxes of human moral responsibility, as well as the need for authentic enlightenment in order to face the coming Judgment with confidence. In order to retell the story of Israel, the allegorist has developed a sophisticated symbolic vocabulary for talking about divine election, human effort, and the dynamic encounter between the two.

Thirdly, the *present* situation within the early stages of the Maccabean revolt provides the necessary context for understanding a great many features of the text. The allegory shows considerable diplomatic sensitivity in dealing with conflicting Jewish schools of thought, and the allegorist goes to a great deal of trouble in order to establish the authority of the *An. Apoc.* beyond the borders of the Enochic tradition.

Once the *An. Apoc.*'s perspectives on the future, the past, and the present have been articulated, it should be possible to provide a new commentary on the entire apocalypse that does not duplicate the work of previous commentators but rather builds on what is useful in their work and provides what is hopefully a more systematic and complete analysis of the objectives of this Enochic writing.

5. *Thesis*

I hope to show that the *An. Apoc.* is an ambitious theological interpretation of human history through the lens of the Abrahamic covenant, setting forth an *Urzeit wird Endzeit* model that puts Eden-to-Isaac on one end and Jacob-to-Eden (regained) on the other, with the history of the nation of Israel taking place between the mundane Jacob of old and the heavenly Jacob yet to come. The allegory retells Israel's history in order to illustrate (1) the dynamics of moral responsibility and (2) the paramount necessity of an authentic encounter with the divine ("beholding the glory of God"), an experience not bound to any age or to any office or institution. In the end, the history of Israel the nation serves no other purpose, and it disappears when the "true

Israel" appears, both as eponymous Patriarch and as transformed people. Thus is fulfilled the promise to Abraham of universal blessing through his offspring, which is the governing dynamic of the entire allegory.

PART ONE

THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* AND THE OFFSPRING OF ABRAHAM

CHAPTER ONE

LOOKING AT THE FUTURE: THE SCOPE AND THE FOCUS OF THE ALLEGORY

1. *Is the Scope of the Allegory Particular or Universal?*

In reviewing the various interpretations of the *An. Apoc.*, we have seen that one of the fundamental areas of conflict is the scope of the allegory: Is it concerned with the salvation of humanity in general or the salvation of Israel in particular? As the preceding survey shows, how one reads the ending of the *An. Apoc.* is crucial for answering this question, and hence for the interpretation of the entire allegory.

As the *An. Apoc.* approaches its conclusion, we learn that the Maccabean conflict taking place in the author's day is expected to end with God's intervention, ushering history into its eschatological phase (90:13–19). This is followed by judgment on all the wicked (vv. 20–27) and the creation of a New Jerusalem, in which all Israelites (sheep) are pure, healthy, and clear-eyed, while the remaining Gentiles (birds and beasts) are subservient to them, even though they too begin to assemble with the sheep in the "house" (vv. 28–36). This series of events concludes with the observation that the house (Jerusalem) is spacious and full (v. 36). All seems well, and one feels that the apocalypse could have ended here. Instead, we find a coda:

> 90:37. And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. 38. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle. The first one became a *nagar* among them, and that *nagar* became a great beast, and on its head were large black horns. And the Lord of the flock rejoiced over them and over all of the cattle.

Most scholars read this passage as indicating a universal return of all humanity to a single, Adamic state; that is, a state of primordial integrity, a state of original goodness. The Jewish sheep and the Gentile wild animals become *white cattle*, the one species which represented all of humanity from Adam until the Flood (85:3–89:10), with the important difference that here at the end of all things, there are no more black cattle to commit crimes or red cattle to be victimized. Although the text is difficult, it would appear that the

mysterious white bull who appears in verse 37 serves as some sort of catalyst or harbinger of the universal transformation.

This is the dominant reading of the text, but as we have seen, this reading has been rejected by a significant number of scholars. The counterarguments take three distinct forms, but all of these scholars agree in their insistence that the *An. Apoc.* focuses on the salvation of Israel (or the elect of Israel), and therefore could hardly be expected to anticipate the elimination of "Israel" as a meaningful category. One group maintains that the phrase translated here, "all their species were transformed" (v. 38), should instead be translated, "all their *kindred* were transformed," or "all their *families* were transformed," or something similar, and they then restrict this transformation to the sheep alone.[1] This interpretation refers the possessive suffix back to the sheep in verse 35. But this is an artificial way of reading the syntax, since it ignores the closest antecedent: the birds and beasts of verse 37. A few scholars take the opposite approach, applying "all their species were transformed" to the *wild animals* alone, leaving the sheep as sheep.[2] Some support for this view can be claimed in the fact that God is still called the "Lord of the flock" in verse 38. But since "Lord of the flock" has been used as the standard title for God throughout the allegory (about 30 times), it is doubtful that its continued use here can carry a great deal of special exegetical weight. A serious problem with this reading of the allegory is that the Gentiles end up more like Adam, and even more akin to Abraham, than the Jews ever will, since the Gentiles become white cattle while the sheep remain sheep. To say the least, this would be a peculiar way to conclude a vision that supposedly concerns itself primarily with the salvation of Israel! A third and more radical approach to the text is to excise 90:37–38 as a secondary addition.[3]

---

[1] So Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 241–242; Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSS11; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 101; Ida Fröhlich, *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (JSPSS 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 85; and Mark Adam Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 470–471, 526. Translation of አዝማዲሆሙ ፡ as "their kindred" or "their families" is permissable, since ዘመድ ፡ = γένος. See August Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae cum Indice Latino* (Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1865), 1043.

[2] So Ego, "Vergangenheit," 186; and David R. Jackson, *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (JSPSS 49; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 39. Jackson is more explicit in an unpublished 2007 seminar paper, "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism," where he maintains that even though the submissive Gentiles of the eschatological age become white cattle in 90:38, "they are not counted among the elect" (p. 4), inasmuch as the sheep remain sheep.

[3] So Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 42–43; Müller, *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apocalyptik*, 164–166; and Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt*, 208–211.

There is no manuscript support for this, and it leaves unexplained the universal vision already implicit in verse 33:

> And all who had been destroyed and dispersed, and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky, gathered together in that house, and the Lord of the flock rejoiced with great joy because all of them had become good, and they had returned to his house.

Reese recognizes that this passage poses difficulties for his interpretation, and so he includes "all the beasts of the field and all of the birds of the sky" in verse 33 as part of the interpolation he believes is represented in 90:37–38.[4] George Nickelsburg is among those critics who see a universal transformation in 90:38, but nevertheless, he too finds verse 33 problematic and emends the text: "And all that had been destroyed and dispersed ⟨by⟩ all the wild beasts …"[5] Both of these scholars have difficulty with the claim that the Gentiles will *return* (ገብአ፡ = ἐπιστρέφω) to the "house," but this language harmonizes well with the imagery of Psalm 87, which claims that all peoples originated in Zion. This Psalm is an example of an ancient, traditional association between the mountain of God and Eden/Paradise.[6] As it happens, one place this connection is actively explored is in the early Enoch literature (see *1En* 24–26, 32), and its continuing popularity can be seen in a passage like *T. Dan* 5:12, where the New Jerusalem and Eden are identified.[7] In light of this common motif, it seems reasonable to infer that when *1En* 90:33 describes the congregating of all peoples into Jerusalem as a *return*, it foreshadows the transformation of verse 38 and characterizes it as a restoration of Edenic humanity. This in turn further confirms that the universal interpretation of that verse is a sound one.

It is fair to conclude that the various efforts to avoid the universalism implicit in *1En* 90:37–38 make unrealistic demands on the reader or do violence to the text. The approach taken by the majority of scholars makes the most satisfactory sense. These final verses show that the *scope* of the allegory does indeed encompass the salvation of the whole human race, Jew and Gentile, and since both sheep and wild animals disappear into a uniform race of white cattle, it is reasonable also to conclude that the

---

[4] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 43. With regard to 90:33 especially, one might ask why a universalizing interpolator would be so subtle.

[5] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 402–403.

[6] See, e.g., Margaret Barker, *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem* (London: SPCK, 1991), 57–70; and Lawrence E. Stager, "Jerusalem as Eden," *BAR* 26/3 (May/June 2000), 36–47.

[7] "And the saints shall refresh themselves in Eden; the righteous shall rejoice in the New Jerusalem" (trans. H.C. Kee in *OTP* 1. 810).

An. Apoc. expects "Israel" as a distinctive political or ethnic category to evaporate in the Eschaton. How does this remarkable circumstance come about? The text is far from explicit on this point, but the mysterious white bull who appears in 90:37 seems to play a central role.

2. *The Focus of the Allegory: Eschatological Transformation*

a. *The* nagar *of* 1 En *90:38*

If the *scope* of the allegory is universal, the *focus* seems to be on an eschatological event, a transformation that makes this world salvation a reality. We have already seen that at the center of this transforming event stands the white bull of 90:37–38. Therefore, a sound interpretation of this particular figure would seem to be crucial for the interpretation of the entire allegory. Before anything more can be said about him, however, it is necessary to come to terms with the notorious *nagar* (ነገር ፡) of verse 38.

We have only the Ethiopic version of the text at this point. None of the lexical meanings of *nagar* ("word," "thing," "affair") seems appropriate. Given the context, it has usually been supposed that some kind of animal stands behind *nagar* in the original Aramaic. The proposed solutions to this problem may be presented in tabular form:[8]

Original	*Error*	*First proposed by* ____ (*Accepted by* ____)
ראמא "wild ox"	Transliterated as ρημα ("word") rather than translated	Dillmann (Charles[1893], Martin, Beer, Milik, Knibb, Uhlig, Black, Mitchell, et al.)[9]
טלה "lamb"	Misread as מלה ("word," "thing")	Goldschmidt (Charles[1912], Hammershaimb, Widengren)[10]

[8] I omit the solution of Morna Hooker (*The Son of Man in Mark* [London: SPCK, 1967], 68) since a mistaken reading of משל as "byword" rather than "ruler" works in Hebrew but not Aramaic.

[9] August Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1853), 287–288; Charles, *Book of Enoch* (1st edition, 1893), 258–259; Georg Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," *APAT* 2. 298; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 235; Jozef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 45; Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2. 216; Siegbert Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch* (JSHRZ 5.6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984), 704; Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 280; Mitchell, "Firstborn *Shor* and *Rem*," 217. Dillmann's solution presumes a Hebrew original (ראם), but the solution works equally well in Aramaic.

[10] Lazarus Goldschmidt, *Das Buch Henoch aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich*

Original	*Error*	*First proposed by* ____ (*Accepted by* ____)
אִמַּר "lamb"	Misread as אֵמַר ("word," "speech")	Charles[1920] and Lindars independently (Olson)[11]
ראימא "wild ox"	Misread as מאמרא ("word")	Torrey[12]
דבר "leader"	Aramaic דבר read as if it were Hebrew דבר (= "word")	Nickelsburg (Tiller[2003])[13]

A very different solution is suggested by Daniel Assefa, who argues that the original did indeed read מלה ("word," "thing"), and that *nagar* is not a corruption. He appeals to traditional Ethiopian exegesis, which makes a sharp distinction between the white bull of 90:37 (= Christ) and the great beast of 90:38 (= Antichrist). The "first one" (v. 38) refers not to the white bull but back to the first fallen star of 90:21, a satanic figure, and *nagar* ("thing") is then given a disparaging interpretation: the first one became a *worthless* thing, a *ridiculous* thing.[14] Despite this commendable effort to defend the text as it stands, Assefa's proposal merely substitutes one corruption for another, since he is forced to admit that a pejorative adjective for *nagar* must have dropped out of the text.[15] It is plain that the traditional exegesis is striving to make sense out of a difficult scripture, and in so doing it reads a detailed Antichrist narrative into it that goes well beyond the text. Where in the *An. Apoc.*, one might ask, can we find the necessary *defeat* of this Antichrist figure? Assefa offers a second possibility: that 90:38b is a later interpolation inspired by belief in the coming of the Antichrist.[16] But this

hebräische Abfassungssprache zurückübersetzt, mit einer Einleitung und Noten versehen (Berlin: R. Heinrich, 1892), 90; Charles, *Book of Enoch* (2nd edition, 1912), 128; Erling Hammershaimb, "Første Enoksbog," in *De gammelltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer med inledning og noter* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1956), 155 n. f; Geo Widengren, "Iran and Israel in Parthian Times with Special Regard to the Ethiopic Book of Enoch," *Temenos* 2 (1968), 139–177 (165 n. 52).

[11] R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920), 2. 452; Barnabas Lindars, "A Bull, a Lamb and a Word: 1 Enoch xc.38," *NTS* 22 (1976), 483–486 (485); Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 213.

[12] C.C. Torrey, "The Messiah Son of Ephraim," *JBL* 66 (1947), 253–277 (267).

[13] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 403; Patrick Tiller, "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 1–36; 81–108,'" in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck; JSJSup 80: Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2.365–372 (367).

[14] Assefa, "The Enigmatic End," 559–560.

[15] Ibid., 560.

[16] Ibid.

does not solve the problem. Why did the editor add such a small amount of material that considerable imagination is still needed to flesh the passage out into a coherent Antichrist narrative?

Most of the other proposals are problematic as well. Although it continues to be popular, Dillmann's suggestion does not explain why a Greek translator would transliterate rather than translate a common biblical animal name, and Goldschmidt's and Torrey's suggestions require a normal animal name to be mistaken twice in the same sentence for a different word that would be far more unusual in context. Nickelsburg's solution is better in that it does not postulate an actual misreading of the script itself, but it still requires an Aramaic word that makes sense in context to be taken twice for a Hebrew word that makes less obvious sense.[17]

Lindars' solution remains the best.[18] He suggests that the Greek translator was a Christian who read אִמַּר ("lamb") as אֵמַר ("word") in order to find a prophecy of Christ in this Enochic writing, and to that end he translated it with λόγος, with reference to the divine *Logos* of John 1:1, 14. According to Lindars, the Ethiopic translator subsequently missed the allusion and rendered λόγος with *nagar* instead of *qāl*, the normal Ethiopic translation of λόγος when this term is used christologically.[19]

Lindars' solution is actually stronger than his own claims for it. First, Lindars wrote his article before the publication of the Qumran fragments of *1 Enoch*, and so he did not know that אמר is indeed the regular word for "sheep" in the *An. Apoc.*, occurring at least seven times in the surviving fragments alone.[20] Second, it is not necessary to argue, with Lindars, that the Ethiopic translator missed the allusion when he rendered λόγος with *nagar*, an argument Tiller finds improbable.[21] As Assefa has shown, Ethiopian tradition distinguishes the white bull of 90:37 from the great beast of 90:38, and it links the *nagar* with the latter, understood as an Antichrist figure. Careful comparison of this Ethiopian exegesis with the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* (late 3rd c. CE or earlier) suggests that such an interpretation of the ending of the *An. Apoc.* was already known in Egyptian Christianity well before

---

[17] The fact that דבר in its verbal form ("to lead") is attested in the *An. Apoc.* (4Q*206* 5 ii 16; cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 403) only makes it harder to explain why Aramaic "leader" would be read as Hebrew "word" in 90:38.

[18] Lindars seems unaware that Charles had already anticipated the gist of his solution. See n. 53 above.

[19] Lindars, "A Bull, a Lamb and a Word," 485–486.

[20] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 275.

[21] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 387 ("the allusion is not that elusive").

the work was taken to Ethiopia and translated.[22] *Nagar is* commonly used to translate λόγος when the latter means "thing," "matter," "affair," and by using *nagar* the Ethiopic translator chose not to read the term christologically.[23] In other words, the gift offered by the Greek translator was not missed: it was declined. Third, some of Lindars' own arguments are poorly considered and open up his otherwise attractive solution to unnecessary criticism. He interprets the great beast with large black horns of 90:38b as simply a full-grown lamb (i.e., a ram), leaving only one transformation in the text, from bull (human in general) to ram (Jewish messiah).[24] Tiller rightly objects that this is anachronistic, since there are no more Israelites (sheep) at this point and all humans have become cattle.[25] But if the "great beast" is not a ram but a different species, then the lamb phase is only an interlude, not a final state. Lindars also loses track of his own argument when he attempts to make a case for the use of אמר as "word" during the relevant time period.[26] As Mitchell points out, אֵימַר is a rare word to begin with, and the "defective" spelling (אֶמַר) is apparently not attested at all.[27] But what Lindars and Mitchell have both forgotten is that Lindars' putative Greek translator has *willfully chosen* to read אמר in this manner for purely theological reasons. The degree of artificiality in taking אמר as אֵמַר might provide an interesting index of the translator's audacity, but it tells us nothing more.[28]

With these clarifications, **ነገር ፡** = λόγος = **אמר** emerges as the only solution to the problem of *1En* 90:38 that does not raise additional problems. We arrive at the following translation of the crucial text:

> 90:37. And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. 38. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle. The first one became a lamb among them, and that lamb became a great beast, and on its head were large black horns. And the Lord of the flock rejoiced over them and over all of the cattle.

---

[22] See the discussion of the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* in the Appendix (pp. 252–256).

[23] Assefa, "The Enigmatic Ending," 556–557.

[24] Lindars, "A Bull, a Lamb and a Word," 485.

[25] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 387; similarly Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel*, 471 n. 89.

[26] Lindars, "A Bull, a Lamb and a Word," 485.

[27] Mitchell, "Firstborn *Shor* and *Rem*," 217 n. 19.

[28] It should be noted that this argument *could* be marshaled in favor of Nickelsburg's solution if someone were to find "leader" more inherently plausible than "lamb" to begin with.

b. *Who Is the White Bull?*

With the text established, the question now becomes a matter of interpretation. The first and most pressing question is the identity of the "certain white bull." Three suggestions have enjoyed widespread popularity among *1 Enoch* scholars. Early critics were quick to identify the white bull as *the Davidic Messiah*, and many critics continue to accept this identification without debate.[29] It is true that the figure seems to take a position of universal rule, apparently headquartered in the New Jerusalem, and it is possible to construe his prominent horns, which are mentioned on both the white bull and on the "great beast," as a royal symbol.[30] Nevertheless, this identification is not stated in the text, nor do we see the white bull anointed, nor is there any traditional "messianic" work for him to do, appearing as he does after the defeat of all of Israel's enemies, the Last Judgment, and the establishment of God's kingdom on earth in a New Jerusalem.[31] This interpretation fails to account for the disconnect between the eschatological white bull and the kingly line earlier in the allegory, including David himself (89:42–49). There is no hint that the white bull is the scion of the rams who led the flock in monarchic times. This interpretation also overlooks the fact that the allegory evidences little regard for the monarchy at any point in history. The embarrassing story of Saul and his failures is recounted in surprising detail (89:42–44), while Samuel, that harsh critic of the monarchic institu-

---

[29] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 286–287; Beer, *APAT* 2:298; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 235; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 215–216. More recent scholars who continue in this vein include Michael Knibb (*Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 216); Paolo Sacchi (*Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* [JSPS 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990], 159–160); and Gabriele Boccaccini (*Middle Judaism*, 134). Jonathan A. Goldstein is emphatic: "The commanding figure of 1 Enoch 90:37–38 is surely royal" ("How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic' Promises," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Era* [ed. J. Neusner, W.S. Green, and E.S. Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 69–96 [here 72–73]). So too is Young S. Chae: "Without a doubt this text is imbued with hope for the restoration of the Davidic line" (*Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* [WUNT 2.216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006], 97–113 [97]).

[30] This is only true, however, if one is selective with the evidence. The horn or horns of divine victory and strength belong to the Davidide in Pss 89:17, 92:10, and 132:17, but we also find such horns given to Joseph (Deut 33:17), Hannah (1 Sam 2:1) and "the righteous" in general (Pss 75:10; 112:9; 148:14). In Sir 45:7 it is Aaron who enjoys the horns of divine favor.

[31] Problems with a "messianic" identification are already noted in Charles's commentary (*Book of Enoch*, 215). Nickelsburg implies that the term may still be appropriate if a broader understanding of "messiah" is adopted (*1 Enoch 1*, 406–407); however, it may be said in response that the looser the term becomes, the less useful it is as a term of identification.

tion (1 Samuel 8), is alongside him as a conspicuous and important character throughout (89:41–46). As for David, in the allegory God deals with him *exclusively* through Samuel (89:45–46), and there is nothing to suggest that the son of Jesse has any kind of special relationship with God. David's military successes and his provision of security for Israel are related with evident appreciation (89:45–49), but literally nothing else is said about his reign except that he had many children (89:48b), a circumstance that did not redound to David's glory; quite the contrary, it produced only trouble for the fledgling monarchy, to judge by the biblical narrative in 2 Samuel and 1 Kings. As for Solomon, his temple meets with the apparent approval of the author, but it is not even connected with Solomon himself (89:48b, 50). The allegory says *not a single word* about any of the kings of the divided monarchy, not even "good" kings like Hezekiah or Josiah. In short, there is no reason to suppose that the restoration of the House of David plays any role whatsoever in the ideology of the *An. Apoc*.[32]

More popular in recent decades has been the interpretation of the eschatological white bull as a *second Adam*, the prototype of a new humanity.[33] This makes a certain amount of sense since the figure reintroduces the long lost white-cattle status to humanity within the context of a renewed creation. One problem with a "second Adam" typology, however, is that it does not account for certain qualities in the eschatological bull, such as its powerful demeanor and its role as absolute monarch. Another problem is that the original Adam is not a unique figure in the allegory but simply the beginning of an apparently unbroken string of white cattle that extends into the Patriarchal era. It is this which allows Tiller to interpret the white bull of 90:37 not as a second but as a *third* Adam, with Noah being the second. The white bull is the patriarchal head of the third and final age, in correspondence with Tiller's tripartite outline of the *An. Apoc*.[34]

---

[32] There is even less in the text to suggest a *priestly* or *prophetic* messianic role for the bull, and no attempt has been made to find these, except for Knibb's intriguing but undeveloped suggestion that two messiahs—one royal, one priestly—may be indicated in 90:37–38 (Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 216).

[33] First suggested by Johs. Pedersen ("Zur Erklärung der eschatologischen Visionen Henochs," *Islamica* 2 [1926], 416–429 [419]) but popularized by Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 45), and accepted by many scholars, including Black (*Book of Enoch*, 20–21, 279–280), Florentino García Martínez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* [STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 75), and André Lacocque ("Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* [ed. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 2001], 1. 114–131 [123, 125 n. 42]).

[34] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 15–20, 384.

This "third Adam" typology would be more persuasive if the allegory clearly exhibited Tiller's three-part structure, but I do not see that this structure is the allegory's "organizing principle," as Tiller claims.[35] If a historical narrative contains two universal judgments (i.e., the Flood and the Great Assize), and if it continues past the second, then some sort of three-part segmentation of history is practically inevitable. What is more to the point is that the *An. Apoc.* calls no attention to these judgments as historical dividers. In fact, history is broken into many other segments with equal fanfare (86:1; 87:2; 88:1; 89:41; 89:59). Even the eschatological era is broken into two distinct sections (90:28–36; 37–39). Tiller argues that the three ages are marked off by the appearance of a patriarchal white bull in each case.[36] This is a circular argument, because it is only true if we ignore the white bulls we do not want and choose starting and ending points for the three eras that happen to coincide with the three white bulls we *do* want. In my judgment, the proposed dividing lines are both ambiguous: Does the first era end with the intervention of the angels (88:1), the commissioning of Noah (89:1), or the end of the Flood (89:9)? Does the second era end with the Maccabean triumph (90:13–19), the Last Judgment (90:20–27), or the birth of the white bull (90:37)? It is telling that Nickelsburg also suggests a three-part structure for the *An. Apoc.*, but his outline does not match Tiller's.[37] In my view no fully-convincing governing structure for the allegory has ever been proposed,[38] and the most that can be said about the macro-structure of history, as presented in the *An. Apoc.*, is that it is episodic.

If the tripartite outline is found to be illusory, one can theoretically argue that the last white bull is a "fourth," or even a "fifth Adam," inasmuch as he resembles not only Adam and Noah, but also Seth and Abraham.[39]

---

[35] Ibid., 15 n. 1.

[36] Ibid., 15.

[37] Nickelsburg chooses 89:9 over Tiller's 89:10 for the beginning of part two, and 90:28 over Tiller's 90:37 for the beginning of part three (Tiller, *A Commentary*, ix; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 354–355).

[38] The elaborate proposals of Stephen B. Reid ("The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse and the Book of Dream Visions," *JSJ* 16/2 [1985], 189–201 [198–200]) and Ida Fröhlich ("The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch [*1 Enoch 85–90*]," *RevQ* 14 [1990], 629–636) have even less to recommend them than Tiller's and Nickelsburg's, since neither of these scholars cite anything in the text itself that would qualify their "structures" as something more than their own summarizing outlines of the allegory.

[39] He is like *Adam* in that he appears out of nowhere, the patriarch of a race of cattle (cf. 85:3–8); but he is also like *Seth* in that only these two are called "great" (cf. 85:9), and in fact some scholars have interpreted the white bull of 90:37 as a new Seth (A.F.J. Klijn, "From Creation to Noah in the Second Dream-Vision of the Ethiopic Enoch," in *Miscellanea*

VanderKam and Nickelsburg are probably on safer grounds when they interpret the white bull as a throwback to, and rebirth of, the superior state of white-cattle humanity in the primordial and early Patriarchal ages, without specifically linking the new white bull typologically to any one particular forebear.[40]

Despite the problems, it must be admitted that the "second Adam" typology has an immediate plausibility about it. The mere positioning of these two white bulls, one at the beginning and one near the end, invites comparison. There is probably no need to deny the typology altogether, since the eschatological white bull may represent a synthesis of more than just one biblical image. It may be the case that "second Adam" typology legitimately explains *some* dimensions of the white bull figure, even if it is not sufficient to explain the whole symbol.

Finally, a number of scholars have noted the similarity between the eschatological white bull and the closely contemporary *"Son of Man" figure* of Dan 7:13–14.[41] There are indeed a number of suggestive parallels. The white bull appears after a judgment scene very similar to the one in Daniel: In both cases, thrones are set up (Dan 7:9 // *1En* 90:20), books are opened (Dan 7:10 // *1En* 90:20), wicked powers representing four consecutive empires are judged (Dan 7:11–12 // *1En* 90:22, 25), and these powers are afterwards thrown into the flames (Dan 7:11 // *1En* 90:25). In addition, the throne vision of Dan 7:9–10, which sets the scene for the Son of Man's appearance, is so similar to throne visions found in early Enochic literature that there is probably a literary relationship between them, as a number of scholars have demonstrated.[42] Loren Stuckenbruck includes references to the judgment scene of

---

Neotestamentica [NovTSup 46–47; Leiden: Brill, 1977], 1. 147–159 [158]; Fröhlich, *'Time and Times,'* 85–86). The eschatological white bull is like *Noah* in that he is likewise the patriarch of a new age after universal judgment (cf. 89:9); but he is equally like *Abraham* in that he appears abruptly amidst a variety of other species and is for a time the only white bull around (cf. 89:10).

[40] James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 168; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 407.

[41] So especially Klaus Koch, *Vor der Wende der Zeiten: Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur* (Gesammelte Aufsätze 3; Neukerchen-Vluyn: Neukierchener Verlag, 1996), 247–250. The similarity is also mentioned in Ego, "Vergangenheit," 185; Lacocque, "Allusions to Creation," 123; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 384; and Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 407.

[42] See *1En* 14:18–23 in the "Book of the Watchers" and 4Q*530* 2 15b–20, from the "Book of Giants." A recent study is Ryan E. Stokes, "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, *1Enoch* 14, and the Qumran *Book of Giants* (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship," *DSD* 15/3 (2008), 340–358. For Daniel 7 and *1Enoch* 14, see also Black, *Book of Enoch*, 149–152; and John

1 En 90:20–27 along with *1 En* 14:18–23 and 4Q*530* 2 15b–20 in his comparative analysis, because it seems to be cut from the same cloth, even though it lacks the precise verbal correspondences to Daniel that would suggest literary dependence.[43] As previously noted, the white bull plays no role in the judgment but appears after it takes place, and he is given no particular task to perform other than—apparently—representing in some way the righteous community. Exactly the same may be said about the Danielic Son of Man. Again, in the eschatology of the *An. Apoc*., the nations (wild animals) are said to be subject to the people of God (i.e., the purified flock; 90:30), but they are also said to be subject to the white bull when he appears (90:37). Similarly, in Daniel all nations are subjected both to the Son of Man (7:14) and to the "people of the holy ones of the Most High" (7:18, 27). Klaus Koch further observes that if the "second Adam" typological interpretation of the white bull has any validity, then a link between the Danielic "one like a son of man" and the Adamic white bull of *1 Enoch* may be suggested by the fact that the Aramaic בר אנש of Daniel is equivalent to Hebrew בן אדם.[44]

If there is a weakness in this identification, it is that it substitutes one enigma for another. There is much debate as to exactly who the Son of Man figure in Daniel is, and so an *exclusive* appeal to this figure as the key to identifying the white bull of *1 En* 90:37 does not clarify matters very much. Indeed, one could begin by arguing an identity for the Son of Man and then claim that the white bull is that same figure, but one could just as well do it the other way around, by first identifying the white bull, and then using that conclusion to interpret Daniel's Son of Man! This may explain why those scholars who note the similarity to the Son of Man are generally content to observe it in passing and do not make it the focus of their analysis of the white bull.[45] Nevertheless, the parallels are notable, and like the

---

J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia: Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 300–303. For Daniel 7 and the *Book of Giants*, see Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants From Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Siebeck, 1997), 120–123.

[43] Loren Stuckenbruck, "Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83.1–2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2. 368–386 (378–383).

[44] Koch, *Vor der Wende der Zeiten*, 250. Since both figures are given dominion over the lesser beasts that precede them (Dan 7:12–14 // *1 En* 90:37), it is possible that behind the imagery of both Daniel 7 and *1 Enoch* 90 stands Psalm 8, which elaborates Genesis 2 and recalls how the first created man, בן אדם (v. 4), was favored with dominion over all birds and beasts (vv. 7–8), and in that capacity enjoyed an angelic, almost divine status.

[45] Koch is the only scholar who leans heavily on this interpretation. Ego, Lacocque, Tiller, and Nickelsburg (see n. 41) are quite brief.

"second Adam" typology, it will prove useful to keep also in mind the "Son of Man" resemblances in what follows.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will argue for a fourth possibility. The white bull of *1En* 90:37–38 is the *true Jacob*, the patriarch of the "true Israel." I believe it is significant that he is the first white bull to appear since Isaac. When Gentile nations first appear (depicted as various species of wild animals), only Abraham and Isaac continue to represent original, Adamic humanity (white bulls), but Isaac sires a boar and a sheep, representing Esau and Jacob (89:10–12), and we see no more cattle as the story of Israel unfolds. When the future white bull is born, it may therefore be seen as the authentic, or ideal offspring of Isaac, or more especially, *of Abraham*, long-delayed but finally come.[46] With the advent of the eschatological white bull, all species are eventually transformed into white bulls. This represents a fulfillment of the promise to Abraham that through him *and his offspring* all the nations of the earth will be blessed (Gen 22:18; 26:4; 27:14). I should hasten to add here that this fourth proposal does not necessarily invalidate the other interpretations entirely (white bull as Davidide, as New Adam, as Son of Man), because the "true Jacob" is an exalted, idealized figure who carries with him something of these other meanings as well, as I hope to show during the course of the study.

3. *The Enoch Tradition and the Abrahamic Covenant*

What evidence is there for this admittedly ambitious hypothesis? Support may to be found, first of all, in the evidence that Enochians consistently took a special interest in the Abrahamic covenant. Abraham appears briefly in the *An. Apoc.* (89:10–11), but the clearest allusion to Abraham elsewhere in *1Enoch* occurs in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17), now part of the "Admonitions," also called "the Epistle" (*1En* 91–105). The *Apoc. of Weeks* is another historical review apocalypse, closely resembling the *An. Apoc.* and probably written less than a decade earlier.[47] It breaks all of history into ten

---

[46] The intermediate figure of Isaac is downplayed by referring to him as a *calf* rather than a bull. The eschatological white bull is therefore the first *fully mature* white bull since Abraham. This is not apparent from the Ethiopic text, which has "bull" (ላዕሠም ፡) for both Abraham and Isaac in 89:11–12, but 4Q*206* 5 ii 12 clearly uses עגל for Isaac in v. 12 and probably did in v. 11 also (Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 242; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 274). Since Isaac was sixty years old when he fathered Jacob and Esau (Gen 25:26), the use of "calf" is unexpected and stands out as a very deliberate choice in *1En* 89:12, which narrates that event.

[47] For a side-by-side comparison of the two apocalypses, see Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*,

"weeks," and the "plant of righteous judgment" in the third week is identified by all commentators as Abraham:

> 93:5. And after this, in the third week, at its completion, a man will be chosen as a plant of righteous judgment, and after him there will come forth a plant of righteousness forever and ever.

If the *plant of righteous judgment* is Abraham, then the *plant of righteousness* that comes after him and lasts *forever and ever* should be identified as Israel, according to Charles, Reese and Nickelsburg.[48] But Stuckenbruck presents a more persuasive case for identifying the everlasting plant as the "true Israel," a righteous remnant among the many off-spring of Abraham.[49] Either way, there is little doubt that by the time we reach a third extension, *the chosen from* the righteous and eternal plant (93:10), we have unambiguous sectarianism, an elect group distinguishable from the rest of Israel.

It can be argued that the *Apoc. of Weeks* identifies the Enochians as the offshoot *par excellence* of this wondrous plant. First of all, the apocalypse opens with an address by Enoch to his sons, and it is difficult to believe that they are not supposed to be in special continuity with the "plant of truth and righteousness" he describes:

> 93:2. Concerning the sons of righteousness, and concerning the chosen ones of the world, and concerning those who have sprung up from the plant of truth and righteousness—these are the things I declare and make known to you, my sons.

Secondly, Enoch proceeds to tell his sons when the "the chosen from the eternal plant of righteousness" will appear: at the end of the seventh week (93:10), which is probably the author's own day.[50] It is reasonable to suppose that the Enochic author identified in some way with this elect group, and that it is being depicted in the *Apoc. of Weeks* as the most authentic claimant

---

399. The lack of any clear reference to the Maccabean revolt in the *Apoc. of Weeks* suggests a date earlier than the *An. Apoc*. See Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 60–62; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 440–441. Many German scholars now date the *Apoc. of Weeks* later than the *An. Apoc*. (see Ego, "Vergangenheit," 172 n. 3 and the works cited there). I find the arguments less than convincing, but in any event, the issue has minimal impact on the present study.

[48] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 25; Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 58; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 445.

[49] Stuckenbruck provides a detailed discussion of the various botanical terms used in the *Apoc. of Weeks* (*1 Enoch 91–108*, 100–102, 123–124). The fact that the plant is everlasting argues against interpreting it as either an individual or as a blanket reference to ethnic Israel in its entirety.

[50] This has been convincingly argued by James C. VanderKam, "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17)," *CBQ* 46/3 (1984), 511–523 (521–523). Cf. also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 440–441.

to the Abrahamic heritage. Thirdly, there is good reason to label this group Enochic, quite apart from the fact that a contemporary Enochic author idealizes them. The chosen community that appears late in week seven is given "sevenfold wisdom and knowledge" (93:10). A number of scholars have identified this wisdom as specifically Enochic revelations,[51] or even as the Enoch literature itself.[52] This interpretation is supported by the strong probability that the author of the "Admonitions" (who may, in fact, be identical with the author of the *Apoc. of Weeks*)[53] identifies the wisdom and knowledge of 93:10 as Enochic literature. In 104:12–13, Enoch's writings are joyfully welcomed by the eschatological community, bringing them "abundant wisdom," which is most probably a reference to 93:10, as Nickelsburg has demonstrated.[54]

The image of the wondrous plant appears already in one of the oldest sections of the *1 Enoch* corpus (chaps. 6–16),[55] part of the "Book of the Watchers." There, however, the plant is associated with Noah. God instructs the angel Sariel to instruct Noah to prepare for the coming Deluge:

> 10:3. "Instruct the righteous one, the son of Lamech, what he should do in order to escape and keep himself alive. Planted from him will be a plant established throughout the generations of the world."

Thirteen verses later, God elaborates further on this future plant:

> 10:16. "I will cut off all iniquity from the face of the earth; every evil work will come to a halt. Then let there appear the plant of righteousness and truth. It will prove to be a blessing. Works of righteousness and truth will joyfully be planted forever."

---

[51] Including Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 296; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 173; and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 42–43. Newsom ("Enoch 83–90," 31) also argues that the community of 93:10 is the Enochians, based on the sectarian language ("chosen").

[52] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 241.

[53] While most scholars think the *Apoc. of Weeks* comes from a different hand than the "Admonitions," in which it is embedded, there remains a significant number of scholars who see no compelling reason for postulating multiple authorship, including Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 255–256), VanderKam (*Enoch and the Growth*, 145), García Martinez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 79–84), Gabriele Boccaccini (*Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 104–106, 109–112, 131–136), Olson (*Enoch, A New Translation*, 17), and Michael Knibb ("The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* [ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 213–219).

[54] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 535.

[55] The consensus among scholars is that this material dates no later than the third century BCE, based on paleographical analysis of the Aramaic fragments from Qumran. See Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 22–28.

"It will prove to be a blessing" recalls the language of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 12:3); in fact, it alludes to precisely the provision of the covenant that the *An. Apoc.* seeks to elucidate, if our hypothesis is correct.

A second Noah apocalypse, now embedded in the "Parables" (chaps. 65–67), repeats the basic pattern. There, God tells Noah:

> 67:3. I will establish your seed before me forever and ever, scattering abroad those who dwell with you so that your seed may not prove unfruitful[56] on the face of the earth; rather, they will be blessed, and they will multiply on the earth in the Name of the Lord.

Again, the plant metaphor is used ("seed," "scattered," "not unfruitful"), and the language of multiplication and blessing echoes the Abrahamic covenant (cf. Gen 13:15–16 and 15:5). Although the date of this particular Noah apocalypse is unknown, it is noteworthy that an author/editor of the "Parables" saw fit to include it in what is widely believed to be one of the latest strata of the *1Enoch* corpus.[57]

But even Noah is not the terminus. He is closely linked with his great-grandfather Enoch in the Enochic tradition—so much so, in fact, that scholars have long held that a body of pre-existing Noachic literature was taken over and reworked within the *1Enoch* corpus so as to make Noah the bearer of Enochic tradition.[58] A more direct link between the Abrahamic plant and Enoch himself can be seen in the verse which immediately precedes the *An. Apoc.* within the *1Enoch* corpus; that is, the last verse of the first "Dream Vision." After a frightening vision of world-wide cataclysm (chap. 83), Enoch offers up a prayer for salvation (chap. 84), ending in this manner:

> 84:6. "So now, my Lord, wipe out from the earth the flesh which has provoked your wrath, but establish the flesh of righteousness and truth as a plant of eternal seed. Do not hide your face from the prayer of your servant, O Lord!"

---

[56] I accept Charles's one-letter emendation of the corrupt text. Uncorrected, the text reads: "your seed will not take counsel" (Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 133).

[57] Among *1Enoch* specialists, the most popular date for the "Parables" is the turn of the era, give or take three or four decades. For a recent survey and discussion, see David Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 415–443. See now also G.W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. Vanderkam, *1Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1Enoch Chapters 37–82* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 58–63.

[58] That *1Enoch* contains Noachic literary material was already recognized by 19th c. critics and received significant support from Charles. See Charles, *Book of Enoch*, xxxi–xlvii (esp. xlvi–xlvii). The nature and extent of the Noachic sections have been disputed, but there is little doubt that Noah materials have been incorporated into *1Enoch*. Noah is cast as a prominent link in the transmission of the Enochic revelations from the oldest strata of the book (chaps. 6–11 in the "Book of the Watchers") to the youngest (the insertion of chaps. 60, 65–68 in the "Parables").

Whether the first "Dream Vision" was written by the same author as the second (i.e., the *An. Apoc.*) is disputed,[59] but in any event, the *An. Apoc.* is positioned so as to be read as *the answer to Enoch's prayer* in the first vision,[60] and the climax of that prayer is a petition before God to establish a holy community ("the flesh of righteousness and truth") as a "plant of eternal seed." In this case, the roots of the wondrous plant extend all the way back to the prayers of Enoch.

The Enochians clearly laid some sort of special claim to the Abrahamic covenant, a claim sometimes justified by tracing its promises back to Noah, or even back to Enoch himself. The logic is simple and ingenious. In Genesis, God makes the covenant with Abram and reaffirms it with him in one form or another many times (12:2–3; 13:15–17; 15:5, 7, 18–21; 17:2–8; 22:17–18). Later, it is reaffirmed again with Isaac (26:2–4) and with Jacob (28:3–4, 13–15). The Enochians seem to be suggesting that Abraham was not the first to receive this covenant, any more than was Isaac or Jacob. In substance, it goes back to Noah and even to Enoch and was simply *revived and renewed* with the son of Terah.

Within the Enochic corpus, the *An. Apoc.* also draws attention to the Abrahamic covenant, and in a unique way. Scholars have noted the surprising fact that God is not even mentioned and does not appear in the allegory until the beginning of the exodus story. Daniel Assefa explains this delay as a literary device, intended to increase suspense and provoke curiosity in the readers.[61] Devorah Dimant offers what is perhaps a more adequate explanation. She points out that God is not mentioned in Chronicles until the beginning of the history of Judah, a subject of obvious importance to the Chronicler. In the same way, the *An. Apoc.* may be drawing attention to the exodus event by delaying God's appearance until then.[62] But it is possible to be more specific than this, since the entrance point is indicated quite precisely in the allegory: "I watched while the flock moaned and cried, beseeching the Lord with all their strength, until the Lord of the flock came down from a lofty abode at the voice of the flock, and he drew near and saw

---

[59] Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 179–182) assumes a single author, and García Martinez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 75–76) finds no compelling reason to disagree, but detailed arguments for separate authorship may be found in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 98–100; and Tite, "Textual and Redactional Aspects," 107–108.

[60] This is pointed out by Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 16).

[61] Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 242.

[62] Devorah Dimant, "מחקרי ירושלים," ההיסטוריה על-פי חזון החיות (חנוך החבשי פה-צ) מחשבת ישראל ("History According to the Vision of the Animals [Ethiopic Enoch 85–90]," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*)1, 2 (1982), 18–37 (28–29).

them" (89:16b). This is obviously based on Exod 2:24–25: "And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And God saw the children of Israel, and God became known."[63] In other words, God appears in the *An. Apoc*. narrative at *precisely* the point that he first remembers the Abrahamic covenant in the biblical narrative. This passage in Exodus is the first explicit mention of any kind of divine covenant (ברית) since Genesis 17, and the biblical text itself says that *this* was the point at which God "became known" (so LXX, probably correctly).

Toward the end of the apocalypse, the *An. Apoc*. reaffirms the special Enochic claim to the Abrahamic covenant. There is a sympathetic portrait of a reform movement of some kind taking place in the author's own day: "And behold, young lambs were born from certain white lambs, and these began to open their eyes, and to see, and to cry out to the flock" (90:6). Using zoological imagery, the *An. Apoc*. depicts here a three-link chain connecting a group that may well include the Enochians with the Patriarchs, very likely the same three-link chain that the *Apoc. of Weeks* depicts with botanical imagery. In the *Apoc. of Weeks*, (1) the *chosen* (93:10; the Enochians, or at least a group including the Enochians) from (2) the *plant of righteousness* (93:5b; faithful Israel), stemming in turn from (3) the *plant of righteous judgment* (93:5a; Abraham), may be compared to (1) the *young lambs with open eyes* born to (2) the *white lambs*, who are in turn implicitly connected to (3) the *Patriarchs* by virtue of their whiteness. With regard to this latter point, note that the *An. Apoc*. uses no color imagery of any kind between Jacob in 89:12 (a "white ram of the flock") and the "white lambs" in 90:6.

The Enochians' special interest in the Abrahamic covenant, then, is pervasive, found in the earliest stratum (the "Book of the Watchers"), the second century booklets of the "Admonitions" and the "Dream Visions" (including the *An. Apoc*.), and on into the time of the editing of the "Parables." If the Enochians saw themselves as the most authentic claimant to that covenant, this would imply that they saw themselves in some sense as the "true" children of Israel, an elect remnant among their fellow Jews.[64]

How did the Enochians understand their duel identity as both "children of Enoch" (*1En* 91:3; 93:2; 94:1; cf. 71:15; 82:1–3; 105:1–2) and "children of Abraham" (i.e., the most authentic heirs to his covenant)? Remarkably, it seems

---

[63] My translation, emending the last verb from וַיֵּדַע to וַיִּוָּדַע, following LXX (καὶ ἐγνώσθη).

[64] Of the three main promises of the Abrahamic covenant (land, descendants, blessing), Enochic interest centers almost exclusively on the blessing aspect. There is no interest in possession of the land beyond a few vague, token references (*1En* 56:6; 93:6), and there are only a few isolated displays of interest in the multiplication of descendants (67:3; 89:15; see below, p. 170).

that they did it by seeing the two patriarchs as somehow counterparts to each other. Perhaps Enoch and Jacob were even seen as sharing an identity in some mysterious sense, as if the earthly Enoch and Jacob were two iterations of the same heavenly being. However one chooses to elucidate the precise relationship, the fact remains that there is a remarkable parallelism between Enoch and Jacob throughout the Enochic corpus. Although Jacob is never named, the development of the figure of Enoch in the ongoing Enochic tradition (as anthologized in *1 Enoch*) bears a striking resemblance to the figure of Jacob, starting with the Genesis materials and continuing into post-biblical traditions about Jacob. This is not Jacob in all of his biblical dimensions, but only in his role as a visionary or mystic, a man who has a double identity (Jacob and Israel) and a series of direct contacts with the divine. This is the Jacob who encounters God in dream visions at Bethel (Gen 28:10–22; 35:9–15), who wrestles with a mysterious heavenly being at the brook of Jabbok (Gen 32:22–32; Hos 12:3–4), and who foretells the future of his sons as he lies upon his deathbed (Genesis 49). The Enochians betray no interest in Jacob's other adventures, or even in his character.[65] Since this facet of *1 Enoch* has escaped all notice, there is little alternative but to establish its existence from scratch before it can serve convincingly as a further basis for understanding the *An. Apoc.*

4. *Jacob and the Enochic Tradition*

a. *Jacob, Enoch, and the "Book of the Watchers"* (1 En *1–36*)

In this early booklet, Enoch is divinely commissioned to tell the rebel Watcher angels that God has passed judgment on them because they have married human women, fathered monstrous giants, and taught occult arts (12:3–13:3). For their part, the terrified Watchers re-commission Enoch to take back to God their plea for clemency (13:4–7). After Enoch has completed both missions, he has a vision, including a remarkable visit to the heavenly throne room, in which he learns that the Watchers' plea has been rejected (13:8–16:4). Of special interest is this passage:

> 13:7. And I went away and sat down by the waters of Dan, in the land of Dan, which is south of Hermon, toward the west. I read the memorandum containing their [i.e., the fallen Watchers] petitions until I fell asleep. 8. And behold dreams came over me, and visions fell upon me, until I lifted up my eyelids to the gates of heaven and saw visions of wrathful censure. Then a

[65] There is nothing, for example, of Jacob the "trickster," or Jacob as a foil to Esau.

> voice came to me, saying, "Speak to the sons of heaven and reprimand them." 9. And when I awoke, I went to them. And they all were assembled together, and they were sitting and weeping in Abel-Mayin, which is between Lebanon and Senir, covering their faces. 10. And I recited in their presence all the visions that I had seen in the dream, and I began to speak the words of truth and vision and reprimand to the heavenly Watchers.

As Nickelsburg has noted, the geographical references in verses seven and nine are not only explicit, but accurate, and this suggests first-hand acquaintance with the area, providing a valuable clue as to the provenance of this early (possibly *earliest*) layer of the Enochic tradition.[66] Enoch has his heavenly vision at the "waters of Dan" (v. 7), identified with Tel Dan, the ancient Israelite sanctuary of the north, located beside an enormous outpouring of springs that becomes one of the sources of the Jordan river.[67] From there, Enoch goes to deliver his judgment oracle against the Watchers at "Abel-Mayin" (v. 9), another source for the Jordan located seven kilometers west of Tel Dan at Tel Âbil al-Qamḥ and identified with the biblical ʾAbel-Mayim, which is another name for ʾAbel-beth-Maʾakah (cp. 2 Chr 16:4 and 1 Kgs 15:20).[68] This site too was sacred in ancient Israel and proverbial as the location of an ancient oracle: "They had a saying in the old days: 'Surely they will inquire in Abel,' and that was the end of the matter" (2 Sam 20:18b).[69] The longer text of LXX, though a little obscure, is noteworthy because it includes Dan with Abel as the place of this oracular activity:

> "They spoke a word in the old days, 'Surely it was inquired of in Abel and in Dan whether that which the faithful of Israel had established had failed'; surely they will ask someone in Abel, even in like manner, whether they have failed."[70]

---

[66] George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981), 575–600, esp. 586. Nickelsburg and David Suter have recently revisited this subject in detailed, independent studies, each of them supplementing the Enochic materials with a broad survey of literary, epigraphic, and archaeological data. See "Excursus: Sacred Geography in 1 Enoch 6–16," in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 65, 238–247; and David Suter, "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of *1 Enoch*," *Hen* 25 (2003), 167–212, esp. 178–179, 186–201.

[67] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 240, 242; Suter, "Why Galilee?" 182.

[68] Suter, "Why Galilee?" 182. "Abel-Mayin" is corrupt in the extant Greek and Ethiopic texts of *1 En* 13:9: Εβελσατα and **ኡብልስያኤል ፡** (*ʾubelseyāʾēl*). Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 196) and Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 248) provide satisfactory explanations for the corruption and point to a parallel in *Aramaic Levi* (4Q*213a* 1 ii 13: אבל מין) and to its corresponding passage in the Greek *T. Levi* 2:3 (Ἀβελμαούλ).

[69] דבר ידברו בראשנה לאמר שאל ישאלו באבל וכן התמו

[70] Λόγον ἐλάλησαν ἐν πρώτοις λέγοντες Ἠρωτημένος ἠρωτήθη ἐν τῇ Ἀβὲλ καὶ ἐν Δὰν εἰ ἐξέλιπον ἅ ἔθεντο οἱ πιστοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· ἐρῶντες ἐπερωτήσουσιν ἕνα ἐν Ἀβὲλ καὶ οὕτως, εἰ ἐξέλιπον.

In a landmark study of *1 En* 12–16, one of the conclusions drawn by Nickelsburg is that the Enochic authors "found the presence of God and revelation at the ancient holy place at Dan."[71] Suter goes further in his recent study, floating the suggestion that "the story of the descent of the Watchers functions as the foundation legend of its [i.e., Dan's] sanctuary much as Genesis 28 does for Bethel."[72]

Suter's suggestion is worth pursuing. Dan and Bethel, of course, were the twin sanctuaries of the northern kingdom of Israel, furnished with golden calves by Jeroboam I and usurping the place of Jerusalem, according to the biblical narrative (1 Kgs 12:29–33). The deuteronomic historian makes no real distinction between the two shrines and damns them together as idolatrous (2 Kgs 10:29). Various eighth century prophets also speak against them (Amos 3:13–14; 8:14; Hos 10:15; cf. 1 Kgs 14:6–16). The biblical accounts of the *origins* of the two sanctuaries, however, are strikingly different. No hint of Bethel's later disgrace can be found in the Genesis narratives of Jacob's divine encounters there or his consecration of the site (Gen 28:10–22; 35:9–15). Similarly positive is Judg 20:26–28, describing Bethel's oracular function while it housed the Ark of the Covenant and enjoyed the ministrations of Phineas, exercising there his eternal priesthood (cf. Num 25:11–13). Dan's origin, by contrast, is presented to the reader as "just about as unlawful as possible."[73] The biblical narrative tells of stolen silver fashioned into an idol and ministered to by an illegitimate priest, later replaced by a mercenary Levite. Idol and priest are later commandeered by the Danites, who ruthlessly massacre the innocent and defenseless population of a northern town and re-establish it as Dan (Judg 17–18). Even the embarrassing fact that the priest in charge of this sanctuary was a grandson of Moses was eventually altered in the text by renaming his grandfather *Manasseh* (Judg 18:30).[74] If it turns out that *1 Enoch* 13 provides a radical alternative to Judg 17–18, that is, a positive etiology for the Dan sanctuary, then it invites comparison with the similarly positive etiology of Bethel in Genesis. Superficially, the stories told in Genesis 28 and in *1 En* 12–16 have little in common, but there are at least four significant parallels between the two.

---

[71] Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 586.

[72] Suter, "Why Galilee?" 202.

[73] Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961), 307.

[74] "Moses" is changed to "Manasseh" by inserting a *nun*. The letter is suspended in many MSS (מנשה cf. *BHS*, 435), which might raise suspicions that the alteration was made very late, but major LXX MSS (Alexandrinus and Vaticanus) also read "Manasseh," so at any rate it cannot be attributed to the Masoretes.

(1) Jacob and Enoch both practice what appears to be some form of incubation leading to a theophany (Gen 28:11–12 // *1En* 13:7–8). Genesis 28 mentions repeatedly the fact that Jacob sleeps with his head on the very stone he will later erect, anoint, and designate as God's house (vv. 11, 18, 22). It is well-known that sacred stones were believed to house gods in the ancient Near East and even acquired the name, "bethels."[75] Sleeping upon such a stone and subsequently having a vision suggests incubation praxis. In *1Enoch* 13, the antediluvian patriarch has a vision beside the waters of Dan after he reads aloud until falling asleep (v. 7). Milik and Nickelsburg note that the riverside is a traditional location for visions,[76] and VanderKam and Suter both argue more specifically that incubation rituals stand behind this episode.[77]

(2) Jacob and Enoch both have visions at their sites involving angels ascending and descending (Gen 28:12 // *1En* 14:5; cf. 6:6; 10:2, 4, 9, 11; 12:4; 15:3). Genesis merely states that Jacob saw angels ascending and descending on a ladder, without further elaboration. In *1Enoch*, however, this motif serves as a major narrative element in chapters 6–16, as the Watchers who descended to Mount Hermon (cf. 6:6),[78] and who thereby abandoned heaven for earth (12:4; 15:3), are told that they will never be allowed to return (14:5). The four archangels, meanwhile, are each sent down to earth on various missions (10:2, 4, 9, 11), and presumably they return afterwards.

(3) Jacob and Enoch both recognize the "gate(s) of heaven" in their respective locations (Gen 28:17 // *1En* 13:8[79]). This phrase is surprisingly rare. In the Hebrew Bible, שער השמים appears only in Gen 28:17, and the gates of heaven are glimpsed only three more times in extant Second Temple literature: in *1En* 9:2, 10; in *1En* 13:8 (as noted above); and in *Aramaic Levi* (4Q*213a* 1 ii 18:

---

[75] For summaries of the evidence, see, e.g., Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 16–50* (WBC 2; Dallas: Word, 1994), 224; or Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12–36: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1985), 457–458.

[76] J.T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955), 398–406 (405); Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 249. Milik cites Ezek 1:1 and Dan 10:4. To these may be added the examples of Jacob (!) in Gen 32:22–30 and Daniel in Dan 8:2.

[77] VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 134–135; Suter, "Why Galilee?" 190–201.

[78] Gk καταβάντες; Eth ወረዱ፡ (*waradu*), cognate to Hebrew ירדו.

[79] The fragmentary Aramaic version indicates an original text of *1En* 13:8 longer than either the Greek or the Ethiopic, which have not preserved "the gates of heaven." Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 193) reconstructs 4Q*204* 1 vi 4 as: לשכני עיני לתרעי ה̇[יכל שמיא] [נטלת] ("[I lifted] my eyelids to the gates of [the temple of heaven]"). For לתרעי ה̇[יכל שמיא, Klaus Beyer reads: לתרעי ש̇[מיא ("to the gates of h[eaven]"). Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 239.

תרעי שמיא).[80] In the latter, it occurs within a spottily preserved passage that describes Levi's heavenly vision, his priestly commissioning, his blessing by his grandfather Isaac, and his investiture by his father Jacob. In the process, Levi visits both 'Abel-Mayin and Bethel, and judging by the corresponding passage in *T. Levi*, it is probable that his vision takes place at Mount Hermon.[81] All three of these "gate(s) of heaven" passages clearly belong to the same environment: the northern shrines. The fourth instance is in *1 Enoch* 9, which is concerned with the other side of the gates, as it were. The four archangels twice remark that the outcries of humanity as they fall victim to the giant offspring of the Watchers has reached "the gates of heaven" (vv. 2, 10).[82]

(4) Both stories provide etymological explanations for the sacred sites. Jacob names his site "Bethel" because he realizes it is the "house of God" (Gen 28:17–19). Similarly, the "waters of Dan, in the land of Dan" is an appropriate location for a narrative focused on the *judgment* (דין) of the fallen angels, as Charles recognized long ago.[83] By implication, *1 En* 13:7 explains how Dan got its name.[84]

Why would the Enochic authors of the later Persian or early Hellenistic period be interested in the old Dan sanctuary? Bethel and Dan survived the debacle of 586, and after a decline during the Persian era, the cultic site at Dan was expanded significantly during the Hellenistic period, although it is difficult to determine whether the new activity was Jewish.[85]

---

[80] The phrase is faithfully preserved in what seems to be the corresponding passage in *T. Levi* 5:1 (τὰς πύλας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).

[81] The textual evidence is complex. See J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67–71, 135–136.

[82] In *1 En* 9:2, the phrase is preserved in all three languages: 4Q*201* 1 iv 10 ה]תרעי שמי; *Codex Panopolitanus* [Akhmim MS] πυλῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; Eth **አንቀጸ ሰማይ** . MS *m* correctly has the plural **አናቅጸ** . Both Greek and Ethiopic preserve the phrase at verse 10 also.

[83] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 31; also Black, *Book of Enoch*, 144.

[84] "Waters of Dan" was indeed understood as "waters of judgment" in later Enochic tradition, to judge by the "Parables" (*1 En* 37–71). "Waters of judgment" is not a biblical phrase, but in a scene reminiscent of *1 En* 12–19, the visionary is told that the fallen Watchers are being punished in sulfuric streams called precisely by that name, "the waters of judgment": **ማያተ ፡ ዙኃኒ** (67:13).

[85] See Suter, "Why Galilee?" 174–177. Although the cultic site doubled in size during the Hellenistic period, curiously, there is no evidence that Dan itself was occupied. With regard to Bethel, some scholars are persuaded that it too had an active cultus during the Ptolemaic era. See Joshua Schwartz, "Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob," *HUCA* 56 (1985), 63–85; and Esther Eshel, "*Jubilees* 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions," in *Things Revealed: Studies in*

Nickelsburg is struck by the correlations between the inscriptional evidence in and around Dan and Mount Hermon, on the one hand, and the thematic concerns and vocabulary of *1En* 6–16, on the other. He further argues that *1Enoch* 13 and *T. Levi* 2–7 (with its background in the older *Aramaic Levi* document) provide evidence of Jewish religious and revelatory activity in the Mount Hermon area during the Hellenistic era.[86] It is possible that the old sanctuary at Dan provides us with the provenance of the earliest Enochic traditions, which have noticeable priestly and scribal elements.[87] If so, the long-cultivated fraternal relationship between the two northern shrines would help explain the earliest roots of the parallelism between Enoch and Jacob, who is firmly connected with the founding of Bethel.

b. *Jacob, Enoch, and the "Astronomy Book"* (1 En *72–82*)

The early Enochic emphasis on the Dan sanctuary and its environs did not last. In fact, *1Enoch* 26 demonstrates that even before the "Book of the Watchers" reached its final form, the centrality of Jerusalem had been (re?)established, even within the Enochic tradition. As we move into the second century, "historical review" apocalypses start to appear, such as the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17), the *An. Apoc.*, and Daniel 8–11. Jacob and Enoch continue to resemble each other as the two patriarchs follow the new trend. The content of their visions now includes detailed previews of human history. By the mid-second century at the latest, a specific "script" has emerged: *A patriarchal figure has a vision in which an angel approaches him and shows him the tablets of heaven. He reads them and discovers there the future history of his family* (*or all of humanity*) *to the end of time. The angel* (*or angels*) *instructs the patriarch to memorize* (*or "understand"*) *the tablets in their entirety, to go back to his family home, and to relate to family members the contents of the tablets. The patriarch then obeys*. Enoch and Jacob both follow this script. The fullest examples are *1En* 81:1–2, in the "Astronomy Book," and a passage in *Jubilees* elaborating Jacob's second divine encounter at Bethel (Gen 35:9–15).

Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Satran, and R.A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21–36 (22).

[86] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 247.

[87] Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 9. One clue suggesting that genuine practices from the northern sanctuaries are reflected in *1Enoch* 13 can be gleaned from the solitary positive biblical description of praxis at the Bethel site. While Phineas and the Ark were there, the distraught Israelites "went back to Bethel and wept, sitting there before the Lord" (Judg 20:26b). Compare this with Enoch's description of the terrified Watchers: "And they all were assembled together, and they were sitting and weeping in Abel-Mayin" (*1En* 13:9b).

1 En 81:1–2	*Jub* 32:21
81:1. Then he [Uriel] said to me: "Enoch, look at these tablets of heaven, and read what is written upon them, and take note of every individual item." 2. So I looked at the tablets of heaven, and I read everything written, and I understood everything. I read the book of all the deeds of humanity, all the children of flesh who will be on the earth throughout the generations of the world.	32:21. In a night vision he [Jacob] saw an angel coming down from heaven with seven tablets in his hands. He gave (them) to Jacob, and he read them. He read everything that was written in them—what would happen to him and his sons throughout all ages.[88]

After they have read and memorized the tablets, the patriarchs are instructed in both cases to go to their families and write down the contents for them (*1 En* 81:5–6 // *Jub* 32:23). Multiple additional examples can be found in Second Temple literature in which both Enoch and Jacob claim to have learned human destinies from reading the heavenly tablets, and in most cases it is said that the tablets are presented to them by angels.[89] What is significant is that *no other characters* play this particular and carefully scripted role, so far as is known.[90] Unfortunately, the current state of scholarship does not permit us to determine whether Enoch borrowed this tradition from Jacob, or vice versa (or whether we should seek a third, less simplistic option). I see little gain, for example, in pursuing the question of literary dependence between *1 En* 81:1–2 and *Jub* 32:21, since scholars cannot decide among three different dates for *1 Enoch* 81.[91] For the present, it is enough to

[88] Trans. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Lovanii: Peeters, 1989), 213–214.

[89] For Enoch: *1 En* 93:2; 103:2–3; and 106:19–107:1. For Jacob: 4Q*537* (probably) and *Pr. Jos*. B and C. See the discussion in Loren Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyer, 2007), 83–86.

[90] The closest parallel would be Moses in *Jubilees* (cf. 1:26–29), but there are differences. In *Jubilees* the angel writes the tablets on the spot and they are given to Moses to keep for future consultation rather than to be read and memorized immediately. Also, the contents of these tablets seem to be heavily concentrated on (1) historical timetables and (2) legislation. See Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 83–84.

[91] If *1 Enoch* 81 is part of the original "Astronomy Book," it dates from the third c. BCE or earlier and is older than *Jubilees* (so Rau, Sacchi, and Olson). If it is part of a "narrative bridge" combining the earliest Enoch literature into a "testamentary" volume, it is a second century work, older than the *An. Apoc*. but possibly contemporary with *Jubilees* (so Nickelsburg and, with modifications, Stuckenbruck). If the "three angels" of 81:5 (Eth 2 only; Eth 1: "seven angels") alludes to the three angels of 86:3, then the chapter is obviously younger than either

note that Enoch and Jacob continue to act like each other, and in this case, the Jacob traditions go beyond the boundaries of Genesis.

c. *Jacob, Enoch, and the "Admonitions of Enoch"* (1 En *91–105*)

Again we have a booklet with a difficult literary history, especially in its opening chapters, but as it now stands in the Ethiopic manuscripts, the literary unit that begins the "Admonitions (or 'Epistle') of Enoch" is an example of the *testament* genre.[92] The opening of this testament resembles the opening of the biblical testament of Jacob.

1 En 91:1–3	Gen 49:1–2
91:1. "And now, my son Methuselah: call to me all of your brothers, and gather to me here all the children of your mother, for a word calls to me, and a spirit has been poured out upon me, that I might show you all that is to happen to you until eternity." 2. At this, Methuselah went and summoned all of his brothers to him, assembling his relatives. 3. Then Enoch addressed all the sons of righteousness, saying: "Children of Enoch, hear every word of your father and listen diligently to the utterance of my mouth, for I am testifying to you and speaking to you, beloved."	49:1. Then Jacob summoned his sons and said, "Gather yourselves together, so that I may tell you what will befall you in the latter days. 2. Assemble together and listen, sons of Jacob, and listen to Israel your father."

Again we detect a common script: *A patriarch at the end of his earthly life urgently summons his son(s), promising to reveal to them their future, addressing them as children of X* (*their father*) *and urging them to listen very carefully to X, their father* (*spoken of in the third person*). *The imperative verbs used in the dramatic scene are all repeated or effectively duplicated by means of*

Jubilees or the *An. Apoc.* (so Milik, VanderKam, Kvanvig, J.J. Collins, and García Martínez). Discussions in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 334–336; Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 273–276; and Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 8–16. For the two families of Eth MSS, see below, pp. 116–118.

[92] See John J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 325–331. That this section of *1 Enoch* is "testamentary" is generally recognized, but there is a reluctance to label it outright as a testament, because it lacks an opening death-bed scene. This is surely too pedantic. There cannot be a death-bed scene for a character that never died! The author has come as close as possible by having Enoch summon his children to him before his final ascent to heaven.

paralleled synonyms (*e.g., "call/summon" "assemble/gather" "listen/hear the voice"*). None of the other biblical examples (or biblical approximations) of the testament genre provide anything nearly so similar to *1En* 91:1–3 as Gen 49:1–2,[93] and none of the other examples of testaments in post-biblical literature are known to be older than *1Enoch* 91. It therefore seems more likely than not that the author of this section of the "Admonitions" used Jacob in Genesis 49 as his literary model for Enoch.

The two scripts we have described obviously go together. As we have seen, it is a widely attested tradition that Jacob is able to prophecy the fate of his children because he has read the future of his family on the heavenly tablets at Bethel (*Jub* 32:21; *Pr. Jos*. B; 4Q*537*).[94] In like manner, Enoch's ability to prophesy the future for his children stems from his perusal of the heavenly tablets, and this too is widely attested (*1En* 81:1–6; 93:2; 103:2–3; 106:19–107:1).[95]

d. *Jacob, Enoch, and the "Parables of Enoch"* (1En *37–71*)

The consensus among scholars is that the "Parables" post-dates the *An. Apoc*. by at least a century or two,[96] but it is necessary to examine this section of *1Enoch* as well, because the treatment of Jacob in the *An. Apoc*. anticipates what is found in the "Parables" much more closely than it resembles anything found in earlier Enochic literature, despite the relative chronological position of the *An. Apoc*.

Throughout the "Parables," Enoch sees visions of a heavenly figure, usually called the "Chosen One" or the "Son of Man," but occasionally the "Righteous One" or the "Messiah."[97] This Son of Man was "chosen and hidden" in

---

[93] Deuteronomy 33; Joshua 23–24; 1Samuel 12; 1Kgs 2:1–9; 1Chronicles 28–29.

[94] The tradition that Jacob learned the future during his ladder vision is also attested in Philo (*Dreams* 1:150, 153–156) and in a number of rabbinic texts. See James L. Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 9–24 (esp. 19–24).

[95] These *1Enoch* references represent at least two and possibly four different writings. The last passage (106:19–107:1) comes from an originally independent piece describing the birth of Noah (*1En* 106–107). The other three come from, respectively, (1) the narrative framework of the "Astronomy Book," (2) the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, and (3) the "Admonitions (or "Epistle") of Enoch." While it is possible that these all stem from one author, most scholars think the three come from two or three different authors. Stuckenbruck (*1Enoch 91–108*, 1–16) makes a case for five separate compositions in *1En* 91–108.

[96] See n. 57 above.

[97] See James C. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1Enoch 37–71," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Minnneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 169–191.

the presence of God "before the creation of the world and forever" (48:6). He is highly exalted, and even sits upon a Throne of Glory (51:3; 62:2, 5; 69:29). In the epilogue (chaps. 70–71), Enoch has a throne vision, during which he is approached by an angel and told that he, Enoch, is in fact the Son of Man (71:14). Many scholars have found this unexpected *denouement* difficult to accept and regard the epilogue, in whole or in part, as secondary to the "Parables." Enoch and the Son of Man are distinct from each other throughout the body of the "Parables"; how is it they are identified as the same person in the epilogue? Where else in Jewish literature do we find an earth-born man having a heavenly *Doppelgänger*, and yet being ignorant of this second identity until an angel enlightens him?[98]

For answers, we turn to Jacob lore, where good parallels are to be found.[99] A number of targumic, rabbinic, and pseudepigraphal texts claim that Jacob's heavenly double was revealed in his ladder vision. The most common version of this legend has the image of Jacob's face engraved upon the Throne of Glory, but in rare instances the motif is more direct, and the *image of Jacob himself* is seen upon the Throne of Glory while the earthly Jacob sleeps below.[100] Note that Enoch sees the "Son of Man" seated on a Throne of

---

[98] For these and similar objections, see, e.g., Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter* (Göttengen: Vandernhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 211 n. 17; 234 n. 80; John J. Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.J. Collins; SCS 12: Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 111–133 (119–124); Siegbert Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 573; and Michael Knibb, "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 48–64 (62–63). In a recent treatment of the topic, Nickelsburg also remains skeptical about the originality of *1 Enoch* 71 (Nickelsburg and Vanderkam, *1 Enoch 2*, 330–332).

[99] Unlike the other sections of *1 Enoch*, in the case of the "Parables" a number of scholars have noticed the parallels to be found in Jacob lore. See, e.g., Geza Vermes, "The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at 60* (ed. J. Neusner; SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 159–166; Joseph Z. Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," *OTP* 2. 708–709; VanderKam, "Righteous One," 182–185; and Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 167–168. VanderKam and Orlov use these observations to argue for the originality of *1 Enoch* 70–71.

[100] *Tgs. Ps.-J.*, *Neof.*, and *Frg. Tg.* to Gen 28:12; *Gen R.* 68:12; 78:3; 82:2; *Num. R.* 4:1; *b. Hul.* 91b; *Pirqe R. El.* 35. These all have the angels ascending and descending on Jacob's ladder in order to compare the face of the sleeping Patriarch with the image engraved on the divine throne. Some MSS of *Fragmentary Targums* place Jacob's image itself on the throne. See Jarl Fossum, *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology* (NTOA 30; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 141–145. The tradition of Jacob's image in heaven, seen by Jacob himself in the dream-vision of Genesis 28, is also found in *Lad. Jac.* 1:1–8, a work that *may* date to the 2nd c. BCE (Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob*, 24–32 [esp. 31]). If Kugel is right, this Jacob tradition is as old as the *An. Apoc.*

Glory as well (62:2; 69:29). An even closer parallel to Enoch in the "Parables" is Jacob in the *Prayer of Joseph*, a lost work that survives only in a few fragments quoted by Origen.[101] Joseph Z. Smith suggests a first century CE date for the *Prayer*;[102] that is, about the same time period to which many scholars assign the "Parables." The largest fragment of the *Prayer* is a midrash on Jacob's wrestling match with an angel at the Jabbok (Gen 32:24–32). Jacob disputes with the archangel Uriel over their respective ranks and testifies that he—the man Jacob—is also the incarnation of the angel Israel, "the firstborn of every living thing" (*Pr. Jos*. A). According to Origen, who had access to the whole work, the *Prayer* also implies that Uriel was instrumental in helping Jacob recognize his celestial identity, since Uriel "reminded" Jacob of this fact while the Patriarch was doing service in bodily form (*Pr. Jos*. C).[103] Once again we find Enoch and Jacob—and no other biblical figures, as far as is known—following a similar script: Both men learn from an angel that they have an exalted heavenly double who has existed from eternity, despite the fact that both of them are also temporal, earthborn men.

Another clue that the "Parables" is trafficking in Jacob lore can be seen in the name of the fourth archangel. The four archangels occur as a group in the "Book of the Watchers" (9:1; 10:1) and in the "Parables" (40:9; 54:6; 71:8–13). The names of the first three are consistent and stable within the tradition (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael), but not so the fourth. In the multi-lingual manuscript evidence for the "Book of the Watchers," this angel is variously Sariel,[104] Uriel,[105] or Istrael.[106] What is striking about these three names is that all of them are used elsewhere to identify Jacob's wrestling opponent in Gen 32:24–32; that is, the angel who gave Jacob the name "Israel."[107] The

---

[101] Smith, "Prayer of Joseph," *OTP* 2. 699–719. For an in-depth study, see also Smith's classic work, "The Prayer of Joseph," in *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 24–66.

[102] Smith, *OTP* 2. 700.

[103] Smith, *OTP* 2. 714; idem, *Map is Not Territory*, 30, 54 (καὶ ὄνομα κεκτημένος Ἰσραήλ. ὅπερ ἐν σώματι λειτουργῶν ἀναγνωρίζει, ὑπομιμνήσκοτος αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Οὐριήλ).

[104] ל]שריא (4Q*202* 1 iii 7 [= *1 En* 9:1]). Many Ethiopic MSS include *suryāl* in the list of names at 9:1. A form of the name also appears at 10:1 in one MS (Tana: *ʾāsuryāl*).

[105] Οὐριήλ (*Codex Panopolitanus* [Akhmim MS] *1 En* 9:1; Syncellus frags. *1 En* 9:1; 10:1).

[106] Ἰστραήλ (*Codex Panopolitanus* [Akhmim MS] *1 En* 10:1). "Istrael" is a common (mis)spelling of "Israel" (Smith, *Map is Not Territory*, 34 n. 16). At 10:1, many Eth MSS also have an approximation of "Israel," but with the name extended through duplication of the last syllable. In general, many of the Eth readings in 9:1 and 10:1 either look like hybrids of Sariel, Uriel, and Israel, or they have two angel names in place of one. In most such cases, the two resemble Sariel and Uriel. See Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 172.

[107] Jacob's opponent is *Sariel* in *Tg. Neof*. Gen 32:25 and *Lad. Jac*. 3. Jacob's opponent is *Uriel* in *Pr. Jos*. A. He is *Israel* in Justin Martyr, *Trypho* 125, and *Pirqe R. El*. 37. The latter tradition

"Parables" makes this connection plain by consistently calling the fourth angel *Phanuel*, taken directly from Gen 32:31–32, where פניאל / פנואל was evidently understood as the angel's name.[108] The angel who informs Enoch that he is the Son of Man in *1En* 71:14 is not identified, but there is a hint in the direction of Phanuel. Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Phanuel go into the house of God in 71:8, but only Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael emerge in 71:9, according to most of the best manuscripts.[109] Why has Phanuel been separated from the group? Whatever the reason, by verse 13 Phanuel has rejoined the foursome, and in the next verse "that one" (most Eth 1) or "that angel" approaches Enoch and tells him his heavenly identity. Since the angel (Phanuel?) who gives Jacob the name "Israel" refuses to divulge his own name (Gen 32:28–29), it may be that the anonymity of Enoch's angelic counterpart (also Phanuel?) is another example of the same motif.

A third point of confluence between Enochic and Jacobic traditions in the "Parables" can be seen in the names of Enoch's heavenly alter ego.[110] It is widely agreed that "Son of Man" comes from Dan 7:13, while "Chosen One" and "Righteous One" come from Isaiah, particularly from the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah.[111] It is striking that Enoch should be told that *he*

---

may go back to a novel reading of the difficult Hebrew in Hos 12:4–5: שרה את אלהים וישר אל מלאך ויכל. Connect וישר with אל and read, "He [Jacob] strove with gods (for Israel is an angel), and he prevailed." At minimum, there seems to be an "Israel" wordplay in the text (so Francis I. Anderson and David N. Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 24; Garden City: Doubleday, 1980], 613).

108 In some Samaritan traditions, Phanuel is one of the four archangels (J.A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect* [Philadelphia: Winston, 1907; repr. New York: Ktav, 1968], 218–219). For other appearances by the angel Phanuel, see Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 136–137 n. 6.

109 The "Parables" is extant only in Ethiopic, and this section of chap. 71 is unfortunately the site of many disruptions. Verses 8–13 are duplicated in whole or in part in several MSS, a few omit "Raphael" in v. 8, and the order of names on the list varies. Despite such problems, the fact remains that Phanuel is present in vv. 8 and 13 in all MSS, but in v. 9 he is absent in nine of the eleven currently-known Eth 1 MSS. (Tana and 2436 include him.)

110 All of the names designate the same character. See VanderKam, "Righteous One," 185–186.

111 Ibid., 187–190. *Chosen One*: Isa 41:8–9; 42:1; 43:10; 44:1–2; 45:4; 49:7; *Righteous One*: Isa 53:11. The remaining title used in the "Parables," the *Messiah* or *Anointed One* (48:10; 52:4), finds no direct reflex in old Jacob lore, Daniel 7, or Deutero-Isaiah, unless we are prepared to give some weight to the intriguing variant of Isa 52:14 in 1QIsa^a, which reads משחתי ("I have anointed") for the *hapax legomenon* of the MT, משחת ("marring," "disfigurement"). This yields the reading, "I have anointed his visage beyond that of any man." Martin Hengel and Daniel P. Bailey argue that the reading of 1QIsa^a is evidence not for the original text of Isaiah but for a literally messianic interpretation of the Servant among Qumran copyists (Martin Hengel with Daniel P. Bailey, "The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian

is this character, because both the Isaianic Servant and the Danielic Son of Man are identified as Jacob/Israel.[112] This is direct and explicit in the case of the Isaianic Servant (41:8; LXX 42:1; 44:1–2; 45:4). The chain leading from Daniel's Son of Man to Jacob/Israel is less obvious, but the links in the chain seem sturdy. A comparison of the language in Dan 7:14 and 27 suggests that the Son of Man is in some sense a heavenly representative of the "people of the holy ones of the Most High" (7:27). It is not unreasonable to suppose that the much-discussed *maskilim* ("wise ones"), who appear later in the book, are part of this holy community. They are the "wise ones of the people" (11:33 משכילי עם). Both the term "*maskilim*" itself and the fact that the *maskilim* "make many righteous" (12:3 מצדיקי הרבים) have long been recognized as allusions to the "Suffering Servant" in Isa 52–53.[113] Just as the community or communities behind Trito-Isaiah (Isa 55–66) show their radical identification with the Servant and Chosen One of Deutero-Isaiah by taking for themselves the designations, "servants" (63:17; 65:8–9, 13–15; 66:14) and "chosen ones" (65:9, 15, 22),[114] so also Daniel identifies the *maskilim* with the Servant,[115] even though the *maskilim* belong to the holy community already radically identified with the Son of Man in chapter seven. It would seem that in the world of Daniel, the Servant and the Son of Man are alternate designations for the same heavenly representative.[116]

Period," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources* [ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 75–146 [90–98]).

112 I do not think it is sufficient to claim, as some do, that "Jacob/Israel" in Deutero-Isaiah is merely a collective, a cipher for the people of Israel. In Isa 49:1–6, the Servant is both *identified* as Jacob/Israel and *distinguished* from Jacob/Israel.

113 The משכילי עם of Dan 11:33 is often compared with Isa 52:13 (הנה ישכיל עבדי); and the מצדיקי הרבים of Dan 12:3 is often compared with Isa 53:11 (יצדיק צדיק עבדי לרבים). See H.L. Ginsberg, "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant" *VT* 3 (1953), 400–404; George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity: Expanded Edition* (HTS 56; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006 [1st ed. 1972]), 38–41; and Hengel and Bailey ("The Effective History," 101–105). Commentaries on Daniel since Montgomery (*Daniel*, 472) have frequently noted these linguistic similarities between Daniel and Second Isaiah.

114 As argued by Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 67 n. 38, 65–70, 152–153, 197; and Elizabeth Achtemeier, *The Community and Message of Isaiah 56–66* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982), 45, 88–89.

115 Again, this is widely acknowledged. "Quite certainly, the author of Dan. 11–12 wished to stress that his group was heir to the mantle of the suffering servant of YHWH" (Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1988], 493).

116 A few scholars have even argued that Daniel 7 is *directly* dependent on Isaiah 53, shortening our chain by a link. See U. Kellermann, "Das Danielbuch und die Märtyrertheologie der Auferstehung," in *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie* (ed. J.W. van Henten et al.;

In Isaiah, this figure is identified as Jacob/Israel. In the "Parables," he is Enoch.

e. *Preliminary Conclusions, with a Caution*

Taken in isolation, any item from the preceding survey could be dismissed as trivial or coincidental, but the cumulative weight of all of them together points to a consistent undercurrent of dialogue between ongoing Jacob and Enoch traditions. Both men begin as mantic visionaries with ties to Israel's northern cult centers. As the traditions evolve, one sees a more specific emphasis on their privileged previews of human history. Finally, if we look forward from the *An. Apoc*. we find a fascination developing with both of them as earthly incarnations of their heavenly doubles. When we remember the pervasive and persistent claims to the Abrahamic covenant throughout the Enochic corpus, it is difficult to dismiss this Jacob/Enoch interplay as imaginary or unimportant.

It would be mistake, however, to read this development only in a strict diachronic fashion. The heavenly double motif, for example, is not something confined to the latter stages of the twin traditions. In the case of Enoch, it is widely recognized that the language of the "Son of Man" vision in Daniel 7 looms large in the latest Enoch booklet in the *1 Enoch* anthology, "the Parables" (see, e.g., *1 En* 46–48). As we have seen, it is in the "Parables" that Enoch sees his heavenly double, identified with the "Son of Man" (*1 En* 71:14). But even in the early (possibly *earliest*) Enochic booklet, the "Book of the Watchers," Enoch sees himself in a dream vision, and already in this case the language used is reminiscent of Dan 7:13.

1 En 14:8

And this was all shown to me in a vision as follows: behold, clouds were calling to me in my vision, and thick clouds were crying out to me; shooting stars and flashes of lightning hastened me onward and drove me. Winds, in my vision, lifted me aloft, raising me upwards, carrying me, and they brought me into heaven.

Dan 7:13

I kept looking in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven, one like a Son of Man was coming, and he came up to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him.

StPB 38; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 50–75 (59–61); and Hengel and Bailey, "The Effective History," 97–98.

Enoch and Daniel both relate that they were seeing a vision, and both were impressed by seeing clouds acting as a sort of conveyance or an accompaniment for a figure going into heaven. The suspicion that these two accounts may be working the same mine is strengthened by the fact that the throne visions of *1 En* 14:18–23 and Dan 7:9–10 very likely enjoy a direct, literary relationship, as pointed out earlier.[117]

As it happens, Jacob's Bethel vision in *Jubilees* 32 also features a parallel with the language of Daniel 7. The heavenly tablet vision of *Jub* 32:21, quoted earlier, begins: "And he saw in a vision of the night, and behold …" (**ወርእየ ፡ በራእየ ፡ ሌሊት ፡ ወናሁ ፡**). Except for the change from first to third person, this is identical to the beginning of Dan 7:13: **ወርኢኩ ፡ በራእየ ፡ ሌሊት ፡ ወናሁ ፡** .[118] We have seen that there is a widely attested tradition in which Jacob sees himself or his engraved image on the Throne of Glory during his ladder vision, but it is impossible to pin this tradition down to any particular era. The motif is a staple in rabbinic and targumic literature, but it also occurs in the *Ladder of Jacob*, which could be pre-Maccabean, according to James Kugel.[119]

There is no need here to take up the task of unraveling and chronologizing what appears to be a complex interplay between Enoch, Jacob, and Daniel traditions. It is probably safe to assume the temporal priority of Jacob materials in Genesis over the materials in *1 Enoch*, but the interplay extends to post-biblical traditions about Jacob as well, and the dialogue between the two traditions may become more complex at that point. We may leave all of that aside for the present. The only point I wish to make here is that it would be a mistake to expect the *An. Apoc.* to restrict its use of Enoch/Jacob

---

[117] In light of the use of Daniel 7 in the "Parables," where Enoch sees the heavenly Son of Man and learns later that he is seeing himself, it is intriguing that already in the "Book of the Watchers" Enoch is seeing himself in a vision, while Daniel in a parallel vision is seeing "one like a son of man." It may also be noteworthy that the chapter of the "Parables" in which Enoch is told he is the Son of Man is heavily influenced, in equal measure, by both *1 Enoch* 14 and Daniel 7, as already noted by Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 218) and Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 34), and stressed by modern commentators: Black, *Book of Enoch*, 251; VanderKam, "Righteous One," 182; John J. Collins, "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 216–227 (217–218).

[118] The Ethiopic here accurately reproduces the Greek, which is the same in both the Old Greek and the Theodotian versions of Daniel: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ.

[119] In addition to Kugel's argument for a possible pre-Maccabean date for the *Ladder of Jacob* (Kugel, *Ladder of Jacob*, 24–32 [esp. 31]), there is also the presence of the angel Sariel in this tradition (*Targ. Neof.* Gen 32:25; *Lad. Jac.* 3). As one of the four archangels, Sariel can only be found in the earliest surviving lists (4Q*202* 1 iii 7; 1QM ix 14–16). In later Judeo-Christian traditions, he has been replaced (usually with Uriel).

traditions to the trend documented as lying closest in time to the *An. Apoc.*; that is, the second-century fascination with detailed previews of history, as seen in *1En* 81:1–2 // *Jub* 32:21 and *1En* 92:1–3 // Gen 49:1–2. In fact we will find that it is the heavenly double motif that best illuminates the figure of Jacob in the *An. Apoc.*[120]

5. *Jacob, Enoch, and the* Animal Apocalypse

If after all of this we return to the *An. Apoc.* with the reasonable expectation of finding evidence of unusual interest in Jacob, we will not be disappointed. The author of the *An. Apoc.* has relegated the typical parallelism between Enoch and Jacob to the structural framework of the allegory. Like Jacob at Bethel, Enoch has a dream vision and sees angels ("stars") descending and ascending (Gen 28:12 // *1En* 86–88). And just as tradition held with regard to Jacob and his ladder vision, so too Enoch sees in the *An. Apoc.* an overview of history in advance, including a succession of empires.[121] Within the allegory itself, however, there is no evidence of parallel lives. Enoch sees his famous translation to heaven (87:3–4), and during the Eschaton, he and Elijah are returned to the New Jerusalem (90:31), but the only detail that can be discerned in the difficult text is that this return has no connection to the "judgment." Whatever Enoch's personal role might be in the Eschaton, it does not seem to be central, and no similarities to Jacob traditions are detectible in the sparse account of Enoch's activities.

The allegory *does* put Jacob at a significant crux in the narrative, however. Enoch sees an unbroken string of white cattle from Adam to Isaac, but as we have already noted, the human race continues *from Jacob forward* as either sheep (Jews) or the wild animals (Gentiles) who had already appeared a little earlier, in Abraham's time (89:10–12). This change in animal symbolism has been variously interpreted. Early critics were inclined to see the change from cattle to sheep as foretelling a decline in power and piety.[122] But why

---

[120] It cannot be explored in depth here, but it may be that the dual-identity theme is actually *the oldest* feature of the shared tradition. The ultimate prototype for the figure of Enoch is not one but *two* figures known from cunieform literature: the seventh antediluvian king Enmeduranki and the seventh antediluvian sage Utuabzu, a heavenly figure who acts as something of a *genius* to Enmeduranki. See Rykle Borger, "Die Beschwörungsserie *Bīt Mēseri* und die Himmelfahrt Henochs," *JNES* 33 (1974), 183–196; and VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 45–51.

[121] *Jub* 32:21; *Lad. Jac.* 3–4. For rabbinic examples, see Kugel, *The Ladder of Jacob*, 19–22.

[122] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 255; Georg Beer, *APAT* 2, 295; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 186.

here? Why not mark this decline at some such time as it is thought to have occurred, rather than beforehand with Jacob?[123] Reese suggests that the shift in imagery helps the allegory to distinguish Abraham's elect and non-elect offspring,[124] and Martin Hengel argues similarly, maintaining more specifically that the first era ends with Isaac, because "up to him, the father of the hated Esau and the tribal patriarch Jacob, the history of the nations and that of the chosen people cannot be separated."[125] These arguments overlook the fact that (1) Abraham and Isaac are easily distinguishable from "the nations" by virtue of being white bulls among a variety of wild animals, and the fact that (2) Abraham had already sired both the Ishmaelites (wild donkeys) and Isaac (a white bull-calf). The allegorist has clearly shown that he does not need to discontinue the bovine line in order to distinguish Jews from Gentiles, or elect from non-elect. Patrick Tiller's initial suggestion is that the change from cattle to sheep reflects the shortened lifespan of later humanity in comparison with the Patriarchs.[126] Although this explanation has won some acceptance,[127] the difference in years is not dramatic enough for it to be fully convincing. Abraham died at 175, Isaac at 180, Jacob at 147 (Gen 25:7; 35:28; 47:28). We do not see an abrupt decline with Jacob, nor is there one directly after him. Joseph, for example, dies at 110, Moses at 120, and Joshua at 110 (Gen 50:26; Deut 34:7; Josh 24:29). The biblical picture is of a decline in longevity, certainly, but that decline is depicted as gradual and uneven. A few other explanations for the shift from cattle to sheep have also been offered, but with little acceptance among students of *1 Enoch*.[128]

In my view, it is Tiller's second suggestion that is the most convincing: The change "represents the beginning of the nation Israel and the end of

---

[123] Charles himself recognized that his interpretation did not really work in the case of Jacob (*Book of Enoch*, 191).

[124] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 17 n. 14.

[125] Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1974), 1. 187.

[126] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 275. Tiller appeals to Gen 47:9 for support.

[127] David Bryan adopts it (*Cosmos*, 184–185), as does Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 370, 377), who credits Jonathan Goldstein for the idea.

[128] Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 228) thinks the switch to sheep is suggested by Jacob's profession. A few scholars deny that cattle-to-sheep represents a decline, arguing that the author only wants to exploit the common OT image of Israel-as-flock (so Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 17; Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubliäen*, 194; and André Caquot, "Hénoch = 1 Hénoch," in *La Bible: Écrits intertestamentaires* [ed. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; Paris: Gallimand, 1987], 465–625 [580 n. 12]). One might ask in that case why the author did not simply use sheep from the beginning, or at least from Abraham. Carol Newsom finds the change "baffling" and offers no explanation for it ("Enoch 83–90," 15).

the undifferentiated Shemite line. It was Jacob who was called Israel (Gen 32:28)."[129] With the appearance of their eponymous head, Israel, the people of God acquire a name, become an *ethnos*, and they exist thenceforth as one nation among many. As we have seen, the allegory does not celebrate this development; quite the contrary, it anticipates a dissolution of all national and ethnic distinctions and the rebirth of a single human family. The ethno-nationalization of Israel, based on the Jew/Gentile divide, is regarded as a *negative* aspect of history that will be rectified in the end.[130] That being so, the historical moment when this ethno-nationalization acquired a name would be an appropriate point for a major shift in imagery.

When a white bull finally appears again, near the end of the allegory (90:37–38), he serves as the new patriarch of a reclaimed, transformed, common humanity in the same way that the mundane Jacob (89:12 "ram of the flock") became patriarch of the twelve tribes of Israel (twelve sheep). The original, Adamic line of white cattle is *resumed and improved* (no black or red cattle), making the entire period from the *earthly* Jacob/Israel until the advent of the *true* Jacob/Israel something of a detour in history, a period of waiting for God's appointed time to arrive.

Without some awareness of the running dialogue between mystical Jacob and Enoch traditions within the Enochic corpus, the thesis of a dual-identity Jacob in the *An. Apoc*. might seem far-fetched, but once recognized, the difficulties of reading 90:37–38 all but vanish: *37. And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large*. The genuine offspring of Adam-through-Isaac is finally born, possessing the full dignity of that lost era and the power to rule (i.e., the large horns). *And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. 38. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle*. All peoples submit themselves to this true Jacob/Israel and are themselves transformed into white cattle. *The first one became a lamb among them, and that lamb became a great beast, and on its head were large black horns*. We are reminded that the first Jacob/Israel was born as a mere sheep (cf. 89:12), but now, that sheep has reappeared as a white bull, a great animal with large black horns.[131] Exactly *how* this happens is not explained,

---

[129] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 275. Nickelsburg held to this view at one point, noting that the species change marks "the creation of Israel" (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981], 91). The comment is still in the second edition of *JLBBM* (2005, p. 84), but Nickelsburg's Hermeneia commentary suggests that he has abandoned this view (see n. 127 above).

[130] I agree here with Tiller (*A Commentary*, 20).

[131] The only discordant note is the epithet "black." In the color symbolism of the *An. Apoc*.,

but the allegorist apparently wishes to stress the radical continuity between the old Jacob and the future, new Jacob. In one way they are distinguishable, yet in another way they are indistinguishable, like Jacob and the angel Israel in the *Prayer of Joseph*, or Enoch and the Son of Man in the "Parables." *And the Lord of the flock rejoiced over them and over all of the cattle*. All of this has happened according to divine plan. God is therefore well-pleased with *both* incarnations of Jacob ("them" = the former *lamb* and the current *great beast*). More than this, God is pleased with all of transformed and reclaimed humanity.

One might still ask how Jacob the visionary founder of Bethel, or Jacob the prophet, or Jacob the numinous earthly incarnation of the angel Israel, becomes in the *An. Apoc*. Jacob the future catalyst for universal salvation. I would suggest that a plausible answer may be found in a now-familiar location: the ladder vision at Bethel, to which we have returned again and again. The Bethel theophanies are the occasions when the Abrahamic covenant is renewed with Jacob (Gen 28:13–14; 35:11–12), and one element of this covenant is the repeated assurance that in Abraham and in his offspring all the nations of the earth will be blessed (Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4). This particular promise is expressly extended to Jacob only once: during the ladder vision (Gen 28:14). One way of reading the *An. Apoc*. is to see it as an attempt to show (1) what the promise of universal blessing in Abraham amounts to, and (2) how it becomes a reality, through the advent of the true "Israel" (both man and people) and the transformation that follows it. This explains the scope and the focus of the *An. Apoc*.

---

black = evil, which seems out of place here. See *Explanatory Comments* on 90:38 (p. 230) for reasons why "black" is probably a corruption.

CHAPTER TWO

LOOKING AT THE PAST: THE USES OF HISTORY IN THE ALLEGORY

1. *Is There "History" between the Two Jacobs?*

A desire to set forth the true meaning and the future realization of the Abrahamic blessing explains the beginning and the end of the allegory well enough, and it is sufficient in itself to explain the allegory's scope and focus, but it brackets all of history between its "two Jacobs" as practically irrelevant to the ultimate program of salvation. After the first Jacob/Israel, one searches the allegory in vain for a chain of significant historical events, or a salvific program, or a salvific institution, that clearly prepares the way for the second. The usual channels of salvation history are fully visible in the allegory, but they are all dry wadis. Failure to grasp this aspect of the *An. Apoc*. has led repeatedly to misguided analysis of the ideology behind its historiography.

First, the *An. Apoc*. is not a champion of the Mosaic covenant, as many have noted.[1] The allegory makes only a passing allusion to the giving of the Law (89:29) and ignores the covenant-making of Exod 20–24. This is not to say that the allegorist scorns the Law or is indifferent to it; to the contrary, there are hints that Torah obedience is positively expected.[2] But the Law itself is not lionized, and most tellingly, *assessing the Torah faithfulness of Israel* is nowhere presented as the key to understanding the ebbs and flows of history. Nevertheless, some scholars give the Torah a central position in

---

[1] This observation is usually part of a larger observation about the disinterest in the Sinai covenant that characterizes the entire *1Enoch* corpus. For the *An. Apoc*. specifically, see George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom and The Mosaic Torah," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. G. Boccaccini and J.J. Collins; JSJS 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 81–94 (83). For a good survey of scholarly opinions on the Enochic attitude toward the Torah (including that of the *An. Apoc*.), see Kelly Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1Enoch 17–19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* (JSJS 81; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 289–299. In general, the *An. Apoc*.'s complete neglect of Exod 20–24 is taken as strong evidence that the Mosaic covenant is not a central concern in the allegory.

[2] See especially 89:32: "However, the flock began to go blind and to stray from the path which had been revealed to them."

their analysis. Daniel Assefa argues that Law and covenantal obedience are dominating concerns in the allegory, based largely on his interpretation of "open eyes" in 89:28 as a reference to receiving the Law on Mount Sinai.[3] As I hope to demonstrate shortly, this is probably not an accurate reading of "open eyes." If so, the results are very problematic for Assefa's thesis, since he offers no other real arguments in its support. Nickelsburg is quite clear that the allegory evidences no interest in the Mosaic covenant *qua* covenant, but nevertheless he claims that "the author has selected and structured the material according to a scheme of sin, punishment, repentance, and restoration that has much in common with Deuteronomic theology."[4] But Nickelsburg's subsequent analysis shows that this four-part scheme is so radically redefined and reordered that the deuteronomic pattern it supposedly represents is scarcely recognizable.[5] Nickelsburg is dealing with the macro-structure of the allegory, but even with regard to smaller segments the deuteronomic pattern or cycle is difficult to find, and in fact there is much that is against it. The allegory's color symbolism gives a heavily deterministic quality to the antediluvian world. In its brief summary of the tribal period, the *An. Apoc.* mentions alternating periods of sin and enlightenment without any mention of punishment (89:41). Repentance sometimes leads not to restoration but to further misery before salvation finally appears (89:41–49; 90:6–12). Thanks to divine determinism with regard to the fixing of historical epochs, there are times when punishment may exceed the crime (89:61, 69; 90:22). All of this is foreign to deuteronomic theology.

Second, the *An. Apoc.* cannot be called royalist. As we have already seen, the allegory attaches no importance to the Davidic dynasty in particular or to the monarchy in general.[6]

Third, the ministries of the prophets, though mentioned briefly, come to nothing (89:51–53). In accordance with contemporary and later traditions, Elijah fulfills Mal 4:5–6 by returning around the time of the final judgment, bringing Enoch with him.[7] The text, however, *immediately and explicitly*

---

[3] Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 254–262.

[4] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 359. Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 34, 51–53) maintains that the *An. Apoc.* stems from apocalyptic circles dominated by deuteronomic theology.

[5] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 359. Nickelsburg argues that the "linear historical view" of Deuteronomy is replaced by an "eschatological dichotomy," with the repentance relocated and the restoration redefined.

[6] See above, pp. 26–27, for the unsupportable interpretation of the last white bull as a Davidic messiah.

[7] For the return of Elijah, see Sir 48:10; 4Q*521* 2 iii; Matt 11:14; 17:10–13; Mark 9:11–13; Luke 1:17; John 1:21. For Enoch and Elijah, see *4 Ezra* 6:26 and Rev 11:2–12. (For the historical

dissociates this event from the judgment, and neither prophet contributes anything toward bringing in the new age (90:31).

Fourth, the priesthood and the Temple have a promising start but ultimately fail to finish the course of history. This failure is not for lack of interest on the part of the allegorist. Aaron's assistance to Moses is duly noted (89:18, 31, 37), and the Levites of Exod 32:26–29 who assist Moses in punishing the people are mentioned as well (89:35). The allegory shows a significant degree of interest in the Tabernacle (89:36) and in the First Temple (89:50, 54, 56).[8] Nevertheless, the ruin of this system is absolute. The Second Temple is declared invalid from the beginning (89:73), and the allegory offers no indication that it will ever be reformed or restored, even in the Eschaton.[9] Even the purification of the temple by Judas Maccabee, which probably occurred less than four years prior to the composition of the *An. Apoc.*, is ignored. This is less surprising when it is noted that the allegory does not seem to anticipate any cult or temple *at all* in the age to come.[10] Scholars like Nickelsburg[11] and Bryan,[12] who see cultic or priestly concerns as a

---

interpretation of the "two witnesses" in Revelation 11 as Enoch and Elijah, see Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 213 n. 11.)

[8] As pointed out by Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 355–356).

[9] There is probably an allusion to Onias III in 90:8, but only to point out that he was killed.

[10] A number of scholars find it incredible that the New Jerusalem should contain no temple and assume it exists, despite the allegory's failure to mention it. So Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 284; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 278; Ego, "Vergangenheit," 174; and Stuckenbruck, "Reading the Present," 98. Nevertheless, I think Tiller argues persuasively against making this assumption (*A Commentary*, 45–51). It may be relevant to observe here that Ethiopic ቤት ፡ (*bēt* "house") does *not* represent בית in the one place it can be tested (89:36), a fact that substantially drains the term of the biblical overtones in בית that might tempt readers to find an implicit temple in "house," the allegory's term for Jerusalem. See the notes on 89:36 in the *Translation and Commentary*.

[11] Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 355) claims, "All specific instances of Israelite sin involve cultic perversion or the abandonment of the Jerusalem sanctuary," but he can only sustain this sweeping claim by defining "cultic sin" broadly enough to cover such things as the golden calf incident (89:32–35), the wickedness in the time of the judges (89:41), and Saul's disobedience (89:44). Furthermore, it is not true, as Nickelsburg claims (ibid., 355), that Israel is guilty of cultic sins but never sins of violence. Joseph's brothers sell him to the Egyptians (89:13), the Israelites kill the prophets (89:51), and if Tiller is correct (*A Commentary*, 351–352), the reformers of the author's day face violent resistance from their fellow Israelites (90:7).

[12] As previously noted in the *Introduction* (pp. 8–9), Bryan argues that the *An. Apoc.* betrays a "kosher," priestly mentality that views everything in terms of clean and unclean, a manifestation of the eternal conflict between Order and Chaos (Bryan, *Cosmos*, 169–170). Bryan's analysis does not satisfactorily explain how it is that the allegory's *denouement* renders the clean/unclean distinction irrelevant. Sheep are perfectly kosher, but the surviving unclean beasts are also accepted, and *both* types undergo the *same* transformation before they are fit for the eternal kingdom.

promising key for unlocking the *An. Apoc*., fail to take adequate account of this dead end.

Fifth, the Maccabean conflict, representing in the author's day a militant and hopeful resistance to Hellenistic oppression, waged in the name of traditional Judaism, does not lead to the white-cattle restoration. To all appearances, the allegorist supports Judas and the rebellion,[13] and the Day of the Lord finally dawns in response to the outcries of Judas (90:13–15), but Judas and his followers (the "male sheep") simply disappear from the narrative at that point.[14] Whatever ideological profile the Maccabees represented for the author of the *An. Apoc*., they play no role in ushering in the Eschaton, neither the conventional New Jerusalem nor the new Edenic humanity beyond it.

In short, there is no scarlet thread. Nothing happens within the arena of history during the period between the suspension of white cattle humanity and the resumption of the same that either hastens or retards that resumption. As if to emphasize its radical apartness, the resumption does not commence until *after* the return to the land, the defeat and submission of all enemies, the judgment of the wicked, and the glorification of Jerusalem. That is, it comes *after* the entire slate of nationalistic promises made by the prophets has been fulfilled. What serves as the climax of history for the prophets is reduced in the *An. Apoc*. to a preamble, because final salvation lies a step beyond that point. In fact, it is not too much to say that the *An. Apoc*. subverts the traditional climax by obliterating the Jew/Gentile contrast that gives it much of its triumphant meaning.

There is at least one good parallel in the Hebrew Bible to the notion that there is no real "history" after Jacob, and the parallel provides an instructive contrast to the *An. Apoc*. The re-worked psalm of 1Chr 16:8–36 is a combination of Pss 105:1–15; 96:1–13a; and 106:1, 47–48 respectively. The original historical review in Psalm 105 begins with Abraham (vv. 8–9a), and continues through Isaac and Jacob (vv. 9b–10), followed by the Patriarchal wanderings in general (vv. 12–15), the story of Joseph and Israel's descent into Egypt (vv. 16–24), Moses and the exodus (vv. 25–36), the wilderness sojourn (vv. 37–43), and the entry into Canaan (v. 44), concluding that this was all done so that God's people would "keep his statutes" (v. 45). The Chronicles abridgement duplicates the first part of this Psalm exactly (1Chr 16:8–22),

[13] *Pace* Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 76–77.

[14] *Pace* Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 45), who interprets the ram who accompanies Enoch into the Eschaton (90:31) as Judas Maccabee.

but it stops the survey with Jacob and immediately shifts to the present with a song of praise for God's salvation (stitched together from Pss 96 and 106). Sarah Japhet observes:

> Read as one continuous psalm, its message is unequivocal: the covenant with the patriarchs is consummated in their time. There is no break, not even any "history," between Jacob and salvation![15]

But of course there is plenty of historical narrative, if not "history," between Jacob and the Eschaton in the *An. Apoc*. The fact that the Chronicles psalm skips over all of that material only presses the question more acutely: What is the use of all this narrative if this history is not the creative channel through which God works out the salvation of his people? Put another way, what relevance can the history of Israel have between the *Urzeit* of the promise of universal blessing and the *Endzeit* of its fulfillment? The first step toward answering this question is to clarify what we mean by "universal."

2. *Qualifying for the Blessing*

The soteriological universalism of the *An. Apoc*. is not "universalism" in the sense that everyone is saved in the end, but rather universalism in the sense that all of surviving humanity is saved without ethnic or national distinctions. What they must survive is a series of judgments preceding the "second coming" of Jacob/Israel. Death before the day of judgment presents no complication, since there is apparently a resurrection of the righteous shortly before the white bull appears (90:33),[16] while the wicked dead from ages past make no appearance at the judgment and receive no attention anywhere in the allegory. Presumably, they have already received their just deserts in the grave. For the living, the fact that there will be a final judgment means that there are requirements which must be met in order to qualify for the blessing and the world to come. The Last Judgment then, is paradoxically the starting point, providing the allegory's readers with the criteria that will be used for the screening process.

A traditional judgment scene takes place after the final defeat of all of Israel's enemies, as the Lord of the flock sits upon a throne and holds court (90:20–27). Most of this scene is taken up with judging the two sets of

---

[15] Sarah Japhet, "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles," *JBL* 98/2 (1979), 205–218 (218).

[16] That this verse refers to a resurrection of the righteous is demonstrated by Tiller (*A Commentary*, 380).

wicked angels: the group from before the Flood who cohabited with women, followed by the 70 shepherd angels who abused their positions of authority over the flock (90:20–25). This is followed by the judgment of the flock of Israel. It is remarkably brief and the criterion is straightforward:

> 90:26. And at that moment I saw that a particular abyss, which was full of fire, was opened up in the middle of the land. Then were brought those blinded lambs, and they were all judged and found guilty, and they were cast into this depth of fire and burned up. And this abyss was located south of that house. 27. And I saw those lambs burning; even their bones were burning.

Blinded sheep have not been mentioned since 90:6–7, where they ignore or oppose the reform movement with which the author of the allegory probably sympathized (see below, pp. 87–90). These blinded sheep are condemned and thrown into fiery pits.

Presumably, those sheep who are not blinded pass the test and are on their way to the New Jerusalem and the Edenic humanity beyond. Along the way, the righteous dead are raised up to join the redeemed (90:33), and at the end of the entire process, the outstanding feature of these redeemed sheep is said to be their *sightedness*. The allegory puts great emphasis on this: "And the eyes of all of them were open, and they saw beautifully; there was not one among them that did not see" (90:35). In light of the imminent transformation of all animals (90:37–38), it seems probable that "all of them" in verse 35 includes the docile beasts and birds who have recently joined the sheep in the New Jerusalem (90:33). These Gentiles have arrived by a somewhat different path.

There is no judgment on the Gentiles at the court session of 90:20–27, because their judgment has already been narrated. It is a "last battle" massacre that develops out of the Maccabean conflict (90:13–19). At the expiration of the term of the last of the 70 angels-shepherds, who have (mis)ruled Israel from the time of the Exile, the Lord of the flock steps onto the scene and assists the Israelite sheep in their war against the Hellenistic birds of prey. When he appears, the sheep go on the offensive and route their enemies, who by now have been joined by "all the beasts" and "all the birds of the air" (90:18–19); that is, all of Israel's non-Hellenic enemies as well as the Hellenistic ones.[17] All of the beasts and birds either fall into an abyss opened up in the earth (90:18), or they are felled by the sword (90:19). The

[17] This is the familiar "Gog and Magog" motif: an ultimate assault against Israel by a massive coalition of Gentile nations. See Ezek 38–39 and Zechariah 14. The core idea is already in Psalm 48.

repeated use of "all" in these verses might leave the impression that the Gentiles are wholly obliterated, but when the New Jerusalem is established, we find that "all" of the beasts and birds submit themselves to the flock of Israel, and "all" of them join the flock in the new "house" (Jerusalem), much to the delight of the Lord of the flock (90:30–33). The simplest explanation for the comprehensive language is that the annihilation of "all" the beasts and birds in the final battle means *all the belligerents*. Gentiles who do not fight against Israel (1) survive, (2) submit to Israel, (3) perhaps convert (if that is what their gathering into Jerusalem implies), and eventually (4) attain unto the new humanity.[18] If the eyes of these Gentiles are opened along with the sheep (90:35), then some kind of conversion before the final transformation is strongly implied. The allegory does not anticipate the existence of a class of Gentiles who are absent from the final battle—and therefore survive—but who subsequently refuse to submit to the flock. Perhaps it is assumed that God's active and visible presence on earth, first as judge and second as builder of the New Jerusalem (90:20–29), makes any impulse to resist unthinkable, particularly since the Gentiles who are left are those who were, at worst, neutral toward Israel.

For Gentiles, then, the first and most crucial requirement for entrance into the new Edenic state and transformation into the ideal humanity is *lack of hostility toward Israel*.[19] This relatively generous standard resolves a question that was implicit already with the first appearance of the Gentile nations, represented by a list of fourteen wild animals (89:10).[20] As commentators have regularly noted, these animals are all unclean by Levitical standards, in contrast to the clean animals that symbolize the elect (cattle and sheep). The present unacceptability of the Gentiles is communicated by the Levitical uncleanness of the animals that symbolize them. Most of the fourteen species are also predators or scavengers, animals that may eat either live or dead sheep. Eleven of them are indeed hostile, victimizing the flock at one point or another in the subsequent narrative, but the other three are never mentioned again: hyraxes, swine, and swifts.[21] The hyrax and the

---

[18] I am in agreement with Charles's analysis on all these points (*Book of Enoch*, 214–216).

[19] This attitude toward non-belligerent Gentiles in the *An. Apoc.* has an exact parallel in *2 Bar* 72:4: "Every nation which has not known Israel and which has not trodden down the seed of Jacob will live" (trans. A.F.J. Klijn; *OTP* 1. 645).

[20] See Chapter Five for problems of text and translation with this list. The "phoenixes" are probably spurious and are ignored in the following discussion.

[21] Tiller (*A Commentary*, 29–30) and Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 377) suspect that these are additions to the text, but caution is in order. There is no compelling reason to discard them, and in fact, there may be positive reasons to retain them. See below, pp. 123–125.

swift form a neatly balanced pair: a small, harmless "beast of the field" and a small, harmless "bird of the air," in accordance with the stereotyped twofold formula already used in 89:10. The only possible grounds for denying hyraxes and swifts admittance to the world to come (along with the sheep) would be the fact that they are unclean. These animals are not, and could not ever be, a threat to the safety of the sheep. What is more, they remain offstage for the remainder of the story, without so much as a single contact with the sheep. They therefore present a "pure" case by which readers may test their theological attitude toward Gentiles *qua* Gentiles. By listing such patently harmless Gentiles along with the more familiar hostile and dangerous varieties, the allegory raises questions about justice with regard to the possibility of Gentile salvation, questions that find an answer in the allegory's terms for admittance to the new Eden.[22]

There is another, much less obvious factor involved in the evaluation of the Gentiles. If their eyes are described as open once they are in the New Jerusalem, might this imply that the hostile Gentiles who perished in the earlier battle were somehow blind, just like the wicked sheep who will shortly be condemned at *their* last judgment? There is reason to think so.

The great battle of 90:13–19 echoes an earlier episode at the Red Sea, in which blindness plays a major role in the destruction of the Egyptian wolves:

> 89:21. I watched that flock until they departed from the wolves. **And the eyes of the wolves were blinded**, but the wolves went out, pursuing the flock with all their forces. 22. And the Lord of the flock went with them, leading them, and all of his flock followed him. And his face was glorious and magnificent and terrible to behold. 23. But the wolves began to pursue the flock, until they met up with them beside a certain body of water. 24. And that body of water divided, and the water stood on the one side and on the other before their faces. And as their Lord led them, he placed himself between them and the

[22] What about the swine? There are no clues as to the identity of the hyraxes or swifts, but in the case of the swine, one may at least hazard a guess. There are two varieties of pigs on the list: "wild boars" and "swine." Bryan suggests that these represent wild and domestic pigs, respectively, noting that a distinction between the two was recognized in Hebrew thought (Bryan, *Cosmos*, 116; citing *m. Ḥul.* 9:2). The wild boars are the Edomites. Perhaps the swine (Eth *ḥanzar*) represent the Samaritans, abhorrent and unclean as pigs, but having their home in the land of Israel, and therefore "domesticated pigs" (חזיר של ישוב). Their prospects for salvation are unclear, since the allegory does not say whether the swine participate in the final battle. Unlike hyraxes or swifts, swine *would* be capable of fighting sheep if they so chose. For an association between swine and Samaritans, see *m. Shebi* 8:1: "R. Eliezer used to say: He that eats the bread of the Samaritans is like to one who eats the flesh of swine" (transl. Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah, Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* [Oxford: OUP, 1933], 49).

> wolves. 25. **But the wolves still could not see him**,[23] and the flock went out into the middle of that body of water. 26. But when they did see the Lord of the flock, they turned back, fleeing from before his face. But the body of water gathered itself together—swiftly resuming its natural state—and the water swelled and rose until it covered over the wolves. 27. And I watched until all of the wolves that were pursuing the flock perished and sank, and the waters covered them over.

The account of the final battle, near the other end of the historical survey, appears to contain two parallel versions of the same series of events.[24] That means that there is a *pair* of texts which are relevant for the present discussion, both of which should be compared to the Red Sea incident:

> 90:15. And I watched until the Lord of the flock came upon them in wrath. And all who saw him fled, and they all fell away, into the shadow before his face.

> 90:18. And I watched until the Lord of the flock came to them. And he took in his hand the rod of his wrath and struck the earth; and the earth split open. And all the beasts and all the birds of the sky fell away from the flock, and they sank into the earth, and it covered over them.

At least three details recall the earlier Red Sea episode: (1) *seeing the Lord of the flock*, (2) *fleeing … before his face*, and (3) the image of *sinking* and being *covered over*. It is a reasonable question to ask if these perishing animals were blinded, like the wolves in the earlier episode. The last line of verse 15 is literally: "and all of them fell into his shadow [some MSS: 'into shadow'; Tana: 'into darkness'] from before his face." As Tiller points out, the "shadow" of the Lord is a positive image in scripture, and so the function of the shadow here is difficult to determine.[25] The Ethiopic word (ጽላሎቱ፡ "his shadow"; ጽላሎት፡ "shadow") employs the same root as the term used throughout the allegory to describe blindness, whether in the form of a passive verb (ተጸለለ፡, 89:32, 41, 54; 90:7) or a passive participle (ጽሉል፡, 89:33, 74).[26] It is possible that the Ethiopic text is corrupt, and what the fleeing animals fall into is not *shadow* (ጽላሎት፡) but a state of *blindness* (ጽላሌ፡) before the *face of God*, yet another reuse of imagery from the Red Sea incident.[27] Even if

---

[23] This follows the text of Tana. Other MSS have the wolves unable to see the *sheep*, which makes little sense in context.

[24] See *General Comments* on 90:13–19 (pp. 216–218) for the "doublet."

[25] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 363.

[26] For blindness, the text literally says "their eyes were darkened" or simply, "they were darkened."

[27] The reading of Tana could reflect confusion between *darkness* (ጽልመት፡) and being *blinded* (ጽሉም፡).

we retain the text as it is, however, the motif is not necessarily absent. Saying that the animals fell into darkness is not radically different from saying their eyes were darkened.

It is possible, then, that *all* of damned humanity, Jew and Gentile, are described in the allegory as blind, just as all of redeemed humanity have their eyes wide open. This criterion has in fact been a pervasive motif in the allegory up to this point (89:21, 28, 32, 33, 41, 44, 54, 74; 90:6, 9, 10, 26, 35). If blindness brings damnation, while having "open eyes" is the cardinal attribute of those who pass through the judgment, then an understanding of this motif is obviously crucial.

3. *"Open Eyes": Seeing the Glory of God*

The importance of sightedness/blindness in the *An. Apoc*. has not gone unrecognized. In recent decades, a number of scholars have given the motif special attention, including Reese,[28] Newsom,[29] Tiller,[30] Nickelsburg,[31] VanderKam,[32] and Ego.[33] Nevertheless, I believe there are two persistent mistakes which have clouded much of this analysis. First, I believe that the biblical basis for the motif has not been correctly identified. This mistake has contributed to a second mistake: a conflation of the *blind-vs.-seeing* motif with the *straying-vs.-staying/returning* motif in the allegory.

In all but two cases (89:21, 74b), the eyesight motif is used with relation to the sheep. Reasonably enough, scholars have focused their attention on the first time the sheep have their eyes opened as a potential key to understanding the metaphor. This occurs directly after the Red Sea narrative quoted above (89:21–27).

> 89:28. But the flock left those waters and went out into a wilderness, a place without water or grass. **And their eyes were opened, and they began to see**. And I saw that the Lord of the flock pastured them, and gave them water to drink and grass to eat, and (I saw) the lamb as it was continuing onward and

---

[28] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 27 n. 70.

[29] Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 30–31.

[30] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 292–293.

[31] Nickelsburg, "Excursus: Blindness and Straying as Apostasy and the Opening of Israel's Eyes as Revelation," in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 380–381.

[32] James C. VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90)," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J.H. Newman; SJSJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 279–292.

[33] Ego, "Vergangenheit," 178–180.

> leading them. 29. Then that lamb ascended to the summit of a particular lofty crag, and the Lord of the flock delivered it to them, [while they al]l [st]ood at [a distance].

The allegorical events are easily identified. The first time the sheep begin to open their eyes occurs after the departing from the Red Sea (*1En* 89:28a = Exod 15:22) but before Moses' first ascent at Mount Sinai (*1En* 89:29 = Exod 19:3). More narrowly, and in the language of the allegory, the eye-opening event takes place between the entrance into a wilderness *without water or grass* and the provision of *water to drink and grass to eat* by the Lord of the flock. The wilderness events of Exod 15:22–16:36 are in view, during which the Israelites complain about the lack of water (15:24) and the lack of food (16:3), followed by God's miraculous provision of water (15:25) and of food (16:13–15). As Tiller correctly notes,[34] the allegory has been following the Exodus narrative quite closely throughout this section, and so the place one would expect to find the biblical basis for the eye-opening event would be somewhere in Exod 16:4–12. Nevertheless, scholars have failed to see anything in these verses that would (1) qualify as a revelatory experience or (2) inspire the visual imagery of opening eyes, and all of them have instead identified one of three other passages as the biblical base behind the image.

Some scholars have opted for Exod 14:31: "Israel saw the great work that Yahweh did against the Egyptians. So the people feared Yahweh and believed in Yahweh and in his servant Moses."[35] There is visual language here that could plausibly inspire "their eyes were opened," but the passage is chronologically wrong since it precedes the entry into the wilderness, let alone the crises over the lack of water and food.

A much more popular choice in recent years has been Exod 15:25b–26, after the people have arrived at the waters of Marah:

> 15:25b. There Yahweh made for them a statute and an ordinance and there he tested them. 26. He said, "If you will listen carefully to the voice of Yahweh your God, and do what is right in his sight, and give heed to his commandments and keep all his statutes, I will not bring upon you any of the diseases that I brought upon the Egyptians; for I am Yahweh, who heals you."[36]

---

[34] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 291, 292.

[35] This is the choice of Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 260); Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 228), Martin (*Le livre d'Henoch*, 209), and Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 27).

[36] This passage appears to have been first suggested by Carol Newsom ("Enoch 83–90," 30–31). It is accepted by Tiller (*A Commentary*, 292), Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 379), and Ego ("Vergangenheit," 179).

This passage has a better claim because it takes place in the wilderness, and it piques the readers' curiosity because it amounts to a command to obey the Law even before the Sinai event. However, there is nothing in the language that would inspire the image of "open eyes." Indeed, the language is emphatically auditory rather than visual. In addition, this passage still comes a little too early in the narrative. It follows the drinking water crisis, which takes place at Marah (15:23–24), but it precedes the food crisis, which does not begin until the congregation has moved on to the wilderness of Sin (16:3).

A third option was first suggested in 1935 by Werner Förster and has been taken up again recently by James VanderKam and accepted by Daniel Assefa.[37] VanderKam looks ahead and identifies the Sinai event (Exod 19–24) as the biblical base for *1En* 89:28, but not the legal or covenantal aspects of Sinai so much as the mystical, theophanic elements, which are replete with visual imagery.[38] At Sinai, it may truly be said that the people *see God* much more vividly than ever before. While accepting VanderKam's identification, Assefa sees no need to downplay the emphasis on Law and Covenant, and he relates "open eyes" precisely to this aspect.[39] But here again, chronology is against the identification, since the eye-opener in the *An. Apoc*. comes even before the divine provision of food in the wilderness, let alone before the Sinai event.

Curiously enough, scholars have overlooked an event that explains both the image and the meaning of the image, and which is found precisely in the narrative location that the author of the allegory has placed it: Exod 16:4–10.[40]

> 16:4. And Yahweh said to Moses, "Behold, I am going to rain down for you bread from heaven, and each day the people shall go out and gather enough for that day, in order that I may test them, whether they will follow my instruction or not. 5. And it will be the case on the sixth day, when they prepare what they bring in, that it will be twice as much as they gather on other days." 6. So

---

[37] Werner Förster, "Der Ursprung des Pharisäismus," *ZNW* 34 (1935), 35–51 (37); VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 286–287; Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 256.

[38] VanderKam cites Exod 19:11 and 24:9–10a in particular, along with other passages ("Open and Closed Eyes," 287).

[39] For Assefa (*L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 256), "the vocation of Israel is to 'see God,' which is to say, to be faithful to the Covenant and the Law" ("la vocation d'Israël est de 'voir Dieu', c'est-à-dire d'être fidèle à l'Alliance et la Loi").

[40] With one partial exception, I am not aware of a single scholar who has even considered Exod 16:4–10 as a possible biblical basis for *1En* 89:28. VanderKam ("Open and Closed Eyes," 286) briefly considers Exod 16:7, but he rejects it as unsuitable because it has only to do with supplying food for grumbling people.

> Moses and Aaron said to all the children of Israel, "Come evening, you shall know that it was Yahweh who brought you out of the land of Egypt, 7. and come morning, **you shall see the glory of Yahweh** (וראיתם את־כבוד יהוה), because he has heard your complaining against Yahweh. For what are we, that you complain against us?" 8. And Moses said, "When Yahweh gives you meat to eat in the evening and your fill of bread in the morning, since Yahweh has heard the complaining that you utter against him—what are we? Your complaining is not against us but against Yahweh." 9. Then Moses said to Aaron, "Say to the whole congregation of the children of Israel, 'Draw near before Yahweh, for he has heard your complaining.'" 10. And as Aaron spoke to the whole congregation of the children of Israel, they turned toward the wilderness, **and behold, the glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud** (והנה כבוד יהוה נראה בענן).

Besides the correct location, there are additional considerations that favor this passage as an appropriate scriptural trigger for the "opened eyes" of the sheep in the allegory. First of all, the passage commands attention on its own terms because it is the first occurrence of *seeing the glory of Yahweh* in the Torah.[41] In addition, this is only the fourth use of the noun כבוד ("glory") in the Torah, and significantly enough, the previous three uses of כבוד as a noun are all associated with Jacob. In Gen 31:1, the sons of Laban complain that Jacob has acquired the כבוד (here meaning "wealth") that once belonged to their father. In Gen 45:13, Joseph insists to his brothers that they must tell their father Jacob of the כבוד they have seen bestowed upon Joseph, and that they must bring Jacob down immediately. In Gen 49:6, Jacob prays that his כבוד may not be associated with the violence of Simeon and Levi.[42] By seeing the כבוד of Yahweh in the wilderness, the congregation of Israel enters into a language of encounter that links them with Israel, their forebear. Jacob, too, was someone who *saw*, a point to be developed below. Finally, the implication that the manifestation of the glory of Yahweh in the pillar of cloud was the manifestation *par excellence* can claim the support of the prophet Isaiah, who predicts that it will be so again in the Zion of the age to come (Isa 4:2–6).

Further confirmation that *seeing the glory of Yahweh* lies behind the "open eyes" metaphor can be found by examining the episodes immediately before and after *1En* 89:28; that is, the exodus (89:21–27) and the first Sinai

---

[41] Subsequent examples include Exod 24:16–17; 40:34–38; Lev 9:23; Num 14:10, 22; 16:19, 42; 20:6; and Deut 5:24.

[42] Within the context of Genesis, the common link seems to be that "glory" is a visible sign, communicating thereby a clear message, a public witness of wealth, power, or good reputation. The *An. Apoc.*, however, is probably reading "glory" within a larger scriptural context.

event (89:29–31). Both of these narratives give special attention to seeing the splendor of the Lord of the flock. At the exodus, we are told that the blinded wolves could not see him (89:21). His face is described as "glorious and magnificent and terrible to behold" (89:22). The wolves regain their sight, and we are told that "when they did see the Lord of the flock, they turned back, fleeing from before his face" (89:26). Similar language appears later in the Sinai narrative (89:29–31). While Moses is on the summit, Enoch testifies: "I saw the Lord of the flock, who stood before the flock, and his appearance was mighty, and great, and terrible. The flock all saw him and were terrified before his face" (89:30). The sheep testify that they are not able to stand before their Lord, "or even to look at him" (89:31b).

In the stories which bracket the eye-opening event in the wilderness, it is the *face* or *appearance* of the Lord that is glorious, but there is little difference between seeing the glorious face of God and seeing the glory of God, if one may judge by a passage like Exod 33:18–23, where the two are interchangeable.[43] Thus, an interpretation which takes *1En* 89:28b as a reference to seeing the glory of God is an interpretation which sees the passage in harmony with its context.

Reading *1En* 89:28b as a reflection of biblical passages *other* than Exod 16:4–10 has had unfortunate consequences for interpreting the function of the seeing/blindness motif within the entire allegory. Convinced that the Marah commandments (Exod 15:25b–26) or the Sinai covenant (Exod 19–24) stand in the background, it is common for scholars to take "open eyes" as symbolizing recognition of the Law and fidelity to it, while blindness signifies infidelity.[44] Thus, Carol Newsom thinks that "open eyes correspond to obedience to God, particularly to his laws and ordinances,"[45] and Tiller agrees: "The implication of seeing, then, seems to be possession of God's law and obedience to it."[46] By the same token, "being blinded seems to be

---

[43] The interchangeability of God's glory and God's anthropomorphic appearance is also a feature of Ezekiel (1:26–28; 9:3–4), and it appears early in the Enochic tradition. In the "Book of the Watchers," Enoch sees the "Great Glory" on the heavenly throne (*1En* 14:18b–21), a divine title that recurs in the "Admonitions" (102:3). Another Enochic title for God is "Lord of Glory" (*1En* 22:14; 25:3; 27:3, 5; 36:4; 40:3; 63:2; 75:3; 83:8). Outside of *1Enoch* this title is extremely rare (1 Cor 2:8 and one MS of Coptic *Apoc. El.* 1:3).

[44] The third option, Exod 14:31, has produced less mischief, since its content is more general (i.e., recognizing God's mighty acts and reverencing him), but among modern interpreters, only Reese has opted for this passage as the key to "open eyes." Unfortunately, Reese's interpretation of the allegory runs into difficulty on other grounds, as discussed in Chapter One (pp. 20–21).

[45] Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 30.

[46] *A Commentary*, 292.

equated with falling away from the way shown by Moses."[47] VanderKam, Ego, and Assefa all speak in this same manner.[48] But if the "open eyes" motif is inspired by the vision of divine glory in the pillar of cloud, obedience to the Law *per se* is probably not the main point of the metaphor.

This mistake has led in turn to a second mistake, a tendency to blur together the motif of blindness-vs.-sightedness and another common motif in the allegory: straying-vs.-staying/returning. Since straying away from the path (89:32, 44), or the sheepfold (89:34–35), or the "house" (89:51, 54) refers to actual behavior in the allegory, the language of obedience and disobedience makes immediate sense out of that image, and so long as blindness-vs.-sightedness is taken to mean, precisely, disobedience-vs.-obedience, it is easy to assume that straying-vs.-staying/returning is simply another way of talking about the same thing. Furthermore, the easy merging of *straying* and *blindness* is made still easier by the fact that the images sometimes occur in tandem:

> 89:32. So that lamb which was leading them went up a second time to the summit of the crag. However, the flock **began to go blind** and to **stray from the path** which had been revealed to them. But the lamb was unaware of these events. 33. Then the Lord of the flock was filled with great wrath against the flock, and the lamb found this out, and it descended from the summit of the crag and returned to the flock, and he found that a full majority of them **were blind** and **straying off**.
>
> 89:54. And after that, I saw that they abandoned the house of the Lord of the flock and his tower. They **went utterly astray**, and **their eyes became blinded**.

In like manner, *sight* and *return* sometimes occur together:[49]

> 89:41. At times their eyes were open and at other times blinded, until another lamb arose who led them and **brought them all back** again; and **their eyes were opened**.

It is not surprising, then, to discover that commentators on the *An. Apoc.* sometimes speak of the two motifs as equivalent, or as two parts of a

---

[47] Ibid., 382.

[48] VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 287 ("Israel is truly Israel, the kind of people that it became at Sinai [Exod 19–24], when it sees God, that is, when it obeys him"). Ego ("Vergangenheit," 178) insists that sightedness includes not only recognition of God, but "the practical side of obedience" ("die praktische Seite der Gebotserfüllung"). For Assefa, see n. 39 above.

[49] Possibly 89:34 could be included here ("**When they saw** that lamb, they became fearful in its presence, and they wanted to **return to their folds**"), but it is questionable whether *seeing the lamb* (Moses) really qualifies as an example of the "open eye" motif.

single image.[50] Nevertheless, it is far more frequently the case that the blind-vs.-seeing motif and the straying-vs.-staying/returning motif occur independently of each other: blind/seeing in 89:21, 25, 26, 28, 41a, 44a, 74; 90:2, 6, 9, 10, 26, 35; and straying/staying-returning in 86:2;[51] 89:35, 44b–45, 51. Blindness may certainly be *associated* with straying, and the opening of one's eyes may be *associated* with return and obedience, but if *seeing the glory of Yahweh* is the concept behind "open eyes," we have one image symbolizing an experience and another image symbolizing a pattern of behavior.

4. *Enoch and Jacob: Seers of the Glory*

What then, is this experience that is signified by seeing the glory of Yahweh? Despite the common but doubtful conclusion that "open eyes" in the *An. Apoc.* means knowing and obeying the Mosaic covenant, some commentators have suggested that the image means something else as well, that it represents a *revelatory experience closely tied to the identity of the sheep*, so that the image carries a kind of double meaning.[52] For two scholars, this identity attaches the flock to a particular personality.

As previously noted, Carol Newsom is among those who argue that the open-eye image signifies obedience to the Law,[53] but in addition, she suggests that the image alludes to Enoch. "It is Enoch himself who is described as 'a righteous man whose eyes were opened by God,' so that he 'saw' and 'understood' (En. 1.2)."[54] According to Newsom, "the symbol of the open eyes … connects the righteous community with an esoteric wisdom tradition and treats them as sharing in some way the special qualities of their founder, Enoch."[55]

---

[50] For Tiller (*A Commentary*, 318), blindness and straying are simply two ways of symbolizing the sin of apostasy, and in places like 89:32, the two are "equated," thus proving that "sight and blindness correspond to obedience and disobedience to God's law" (ibid., 294). VanderKam agrees ("Open and Closed Eyes," 282). Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 384) and Stuckenbruck ("Reading the Present," 97) both speak of blindness and going astray as a single "image."

[51] For this unusual passage, see below, p. 78.

[52] Nickelsburg in particular consistently speaks of the opening of the eyes as "a divinely prompted religious awakening" (*1Enoch 1*, 355), a "revelatory event" (ibid., 379), or simply "revelation" (ibid., 380–381).

[53] Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 30.

[54] Ibid. Newsom thinks a conscious allusion is likely because "open eyes" in the sense of esoteric or special knowledge is an image rarely found in the Bible (only Num 24:15–16 and Ps 119:18).

[55] Ibid., 31. Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 381) agrees with Newsom, at least with regard to the

Like Newsom, James VanderKam is a scholar who first of all connects the motif of open eyes with understanding and obeying the Law.[56] But despite VanderKam's identification of the Sinai event as the probable basis for the "open eye" image, and despite the fact that the Sinai episode supplies plentiful ocular imagery, VanderKam surprises the reader by turning away from Sinai in search of the ultimate basis for the "open eye" motif. He finds it in the traditional interpretation of the name "Israel" as "a man seeing God." VanderKam points out that the textual basis of this tradition is Gen 32:24–32, Jacob's wrestling match at the Jabbok. This is the first occasion where Jacob is given the name *Israel*. Even though 32:28 appears to derive ישראל from the verb שרה ("to struggle"), a different tradition broke the word down as איש ראה אל ("a man seeing God"), based on Jacob's bold declaration that he has seen God face to face (32:30). VanderKam argues that just as Jacob is only truly "Israel" when he is "a man seeing God," so also the people of Israel are only truly such when they too see God, an experience depicted in the *An. Apoc*. as having their eyes opened.[57] He argues that this is the real basis of the image, even though by his own admission the Jabbok encounter itself is ignored in the allegory.[58]

We have already explored the Enochic tradition's consistent fascination with Jacob's theophanic encounters, as well as its curious twinning of Jacob and Enoch, and we have also seen evidence that the *An. Apoc*. is typically Enochic in this regard. It is not hard to see that these findings provide support for the hypotheses of both Newsom and VanderKam. They also relieve us of the necessity of choosing between them. If we further recognize that Exod 16:4–10 (seeing the glory of Yahweh) is the most probable scriptural trigger for the critically important open-eye image, this serves to confirm their insights still further. Not only is Enoch one whose eyes are opened, as Newsom points out, he is also one who *sees the glory of God* (*1En* 14:20; the "Great Glory"). Not only was Jacob "a man seeing God," as VanderKam points out, but the contextual evidence provided by the consecutive episodes in *1En* 89:21–31 indicates that seeing God's glory is the same thing as seeing God's face, *as Jacob did* (Gen 32:30).[59]

---

use of the image in *1En* 90:6. Tiller, on the other hand, sees no basis for Newsom's "esoteric wisdom" anywhere in the text of the *An. Apoc*. (*A Commentary*, 292 n. 15).

[56] VanderKam quotes with approval Tiller's direct equation of sight/blindness with obedience/disobedience ("Open and Closed Eyes," 282).

[57] Ibid., 287–288.

[58] Ibid., 292 ("… although the author of the apocalypse does not reproduce the story about Jacob's wrestling match at the Jabbok …").

[59] According to targums Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, Jacob sees the *glory of the Lord*

VanderKam's hypothesis points us to Jacob traditions that are strikingly close to the presentation of Jacob/Israel in the *An. Apoc*., further evidence that he has found an important key. The interpretation of "Israel" as "a man seeing God" is first attested in Philo of Alexandria, who makes use of it, either directly or indirectly, forty-nine times.[60] Philo takes the derivation for granted and never presents an argument in support of it, suggesting that the etymology was well-known by his time. It was popular with Christian authors, but in older Jewish sources it is found outside of Philo only in the *Prayer of Joseph*, a work we have already had occasion to cite as providing (1) the most explicit evidence for Jacob/Israel as a heavenly/earthly double persona, as well as providing (2) the best parallel to the figure of Enoch in the "Parables." At the beginning of the largest extant fragment of the *Prayer*, which is an extended midrash on Jacob's struggle with the angel in Genesis 32, the Patriarch declares:

> I, Jacob, who is speaking to you, am also Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit. Abraham and Isaac were created before any work. But I, Jacob, whom men call Jacob but whose name is Israel, am he who God called Israel, which means, a man seeing God, because I am the firstborn of every living thing to whom God gives life.[61]

Besides the clear invocation of the "man seeing God" etymology, the Jacob who speaks here is similar to the Jacob/Israel figure as presented in the *An. Apoc*. The lamb-and-bull dual identity in the allegory may be compared with the earthly-Jacob-and-heavenly-Israel figure of the *Prayer*. The ultimate Jacob/Israel, the white bull, is like the very first white bull and has even been interpreted as a "second Adam," as we have seen. So also Jacob in the *Prayer* claims to be the "firstborn of every living thing." The ultimate white bull is also like Abraham and Isaac, who were the last of the original white-cattle line, and who were unique in that for the first time the white cattle stood in contrast to other species of animals, which first arose after the Flood (89:11–12). When Abraham and Isaac appear, therefore, they are the *only ones* and they are the *last ones* in the allegory who retain the primordial Adamic nature intact. Perhaps some such idea lies behind the enigmatic claim in the *Prayer* that Abraham and Isaac were "created before any work."

(יקרא דיוי) during his ladder vision at Bethel (*Tg. Onq*. and *Tg. Ps.-J*. Gen 28:13, 16). It is the "glory of the Lord" that stands beside Jacob and speaks to him, and afterwards Jacob affirms that the "glory of the Lord" (*Tg. Ps.-J*. "glory of the Shekinah of the Lord") dwells in that place.

[60] For a detailed list and discussion, see Smith, *Map is Not Territory*, 38 n. 24.

[61] Trans. Smith, *OTP* 2. 713.

At minimum, this statement suggests that Abraham and Isaac are in some sense manifestations of primordial humanity. The *An. Apoc*. and the *Prayer of Joseph* appear to be drawing from a common set of traditions. If the *Prayer* emphasizes that the man Israel is someone who sees the glory of God as he manifests his exalted, most authentic identity, then the *An. Apoc*. tells us that the people Israel are most authentically themselves when they too see the glory of God, and in the end this is the criterion that will qualify them to attain to salvation and extraordinary exaltation.[62]

One can conclude that the primary characteristic of redeemed humanity in the *An. Apoc*. is that they are like Enoch and like Jacob in seeing the glory of God. In those two cases, *seeing the glory* involved an intense and immediate experience of God, but these are extraordinary individuals. Would this kind of understanding of "open eyes" really hold for an entire population and even serve as a criterion for judging the whole of humanity? At first, the answer would appear to be yes. The original historical example involved the pillar of cloud in the wilderness, in which the entire Israelite population could indeed see the glory of Yahweh (Exod 16:4–10). Subsequent opportunities for this sort of corporate mysticism occur at the Sinai event (*1 En* 89:30–31) and in the worship of the original temple (89:50).[63] Nevertheless, eyes are also opened apart from these (89:41, 44), and in the author's day, even with no mountaintop theophanies and no legitimate temple, eyes are opening once again (90:6–10). What, then, does the allegory refer to when its characters open their eyes?

The question is not easy to answer. One way to shed light on the experience may be to examine how the seeing/blindness motif functions in relation to the *other* images used by the allegorist to characterize positive/negative relationships with God. There are at least two others: (1) *color*, and (2) *going astray* versus one of two antitheses: either *staying* in the proper place (for the innocent) or *returning* again to that place (for the guilty).

---

[62] The notion that to see *the glory of God* is also to see *authentic Adamic humanity* would be congenial to the thought behind the Qumranic *Words of the Luminaries*: "[... Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory [...]" (4Q*504* 8 i 4: [... בינו יצרתה בדמות[כה כבוד א]דם א ...]).

[63] Admittedly, "mysticism" can be a vague term. By "mysticism," I mean *direct, unmediated experience of the divine*.

5. *Color and Location*

a. *Black versus White*

The allegory uses a simple color symbolism to indicate standing before God. White indicates righteousness or divine favor. The chosen line of Seth is made up of white cattle (85:8–10), Shem is white (89:9), the sheep are occasionally said to be white (89:12, 90:6, 32), and the good angels are described as "white men" (88:2, 90:21–22, 31). Black indicates wickedness or divine disfavor. The line of Cain is made up of black cattle (85:3–5), Ham and Esau are black (89:9, 12), and it is probably no accident that the birds symbolizing the Seleucids of the author's day are ravens (90:8–13). In two instances, early in the allegory, red is used. In the case of Abel (85:3–6), this is usually interpreted as symbolizing his murder, while in the case of Japheth (89:9), red is thought to signify ambiguity or neutrality. But Newsom argues that in both cases, red simply means neutrality, a necessary category because neither Abel nor Japheth were wicked, and yet neither can be depicted as white, because neither is ancestral to Israel. Newsom assumes without argument that the symbol of whiteness includes being part of the sacred lineage,[64] but the assumption is reasonable: the genealogies of Seth (white cattle) and Cain (black cattle) are both indicated in the allegory, and the fact that each line produced colored cattle after their kind is emphasized (85:5, 9–10).

There are two notable features of this color symbolism. First, no animal in the allegory changes its color until God changes all of them into white cattle at the end. One's color seems as fixed from birth as one's species. There is no indication that an animal has any choice about its color, or any power to change it. Color coding in the allegory affirms that there is an element of strict determinism operating within the plane of history. The white are elect, and the black are not.

Second, the color symbolism is kept separate from the eyesight motif. The color coding is, in fact, rigidly confined to the first part and the last part of the allegory. From Adam until Noah, it is the dominant method of distinguishing the elect and righteous from the non-elect and unrighteous, and it contin-

---

[64] Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 39 n. 25. Nickelsburg disputes the usual view and argues that the red bull is Ham and the black bull is Japheth, based on the order of presentation (*1 Enoch 1*, 376). While it must be admitted that the allegory is not very clear on this point, Newsom ("Enoch 83–90," 39 n. 25) would seem to have the better argument (black = Ham; red = Japheth), which is based on Gen 9:25–27.

ues through the time of the Patriarchs. Jacob is a "white ram of the flock" and Esau is a "black wild boar" (89:12), but as previously mentioned, that is the last use of color symbolism until the rise of a reform movement in the author's own day. At that point, young lambs are born "from certain white lambs" (90:6). At this point too, the ravens come into ascendancy as the primary enemies of the flock (90:8). The whiteness of the angels is mentioned during these final episodes (90:21–22, 31) for the first time since the days of Noah (88:2). After the final war, the last judgment, and the inauguration of the New Jerusalem, the whiteness of the redeemed sheep is emphasized (90:32), and the new era of universally white cattle begins shortly thereafter (90:37–38). During the long interval between the two "colorful" chapters of history, goodness or badness (at least among the sheep) is signaled by the sighted-vs.-blinded motif and the straying-vs.-staying/returning motif. With one possible exception, neither of these motifs is used during the Adam-to-Jacob section,[65] but both are used along with the color symbolism in the latter part of the allegory (see 90:6, 32–35). Thus, the pattern is: (1) *color coding* from Adam to Jacob, (2) *blindness-vs.-seeing* and *straying-vs.-staying/returning* from Jacob's offspring to the pre-Maccabean reform movement, and (3) all three of these motifs from that point to the end.

Even though color coding and the eyesight motif are both used as the allegory moves into its final stages, the two are still kept at arm's length. The closest the allegory comes to articulating any kind of relationship between them is when lambs are born to "certain white lambs," and these young lambs in turn "begin to open their eyes" (90:6). The white lambs enjoy some kind of special linkage back to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by reason of their whiteness, but all this tells us is that the young lambs born to them are somehow elect. It does not tell us whether the opening of their eyes is also something predestined. Nothing in the lineage demands it, as nothing is said about the eyesight of the "certain white sheep" or of the three Patriarchs. The narrative flow does leave the impression that whiteness has some sort of affinity with open eyes, but the precise relationship between the two is left undefined.

Another place the two motifs move within reasonably close range is in 90:32–35. Just before the resurrection of the righteous dead and the gathering of the Gentiles into the New Jerusalem (89:33–34), Enoch tells us: "And all of the flock was white, with their wool thick and pure" (89:32).[66]

---

[65] *1En* 86:2 is the possible exception. See below, p. 78.

[66] Commentators have taken this as a tribute to the righteousness of the sheep, and perhaps to their good health (Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 286; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 215;

The whiteness described here is the specific whiteness of clean and healthy sheep. The allegory will go on to tell us that the eyes of these sheep are opened (89:35), but that observation is delayed until three verses full of events have passed, and the remark about open eyes at that point probably refers not just to the sheep but to all the animals present. The eyesight motif moves in a different orbit, and its relationship with color remains ambiguous.

b. *Straying versus Staying-Returning*

Straying-vs.-staying/returning is the third common indication of good or bad relationships with God in the *An. Apoc*. Possibly the first use of the motif is in 86:2, part of the allegorical presentation of Genesis 5. Translating literally, Enoch sees that "all the large and the black cattle changed their pastures, their stables, and their calves."[67] Most likely, this sentence means that the white (= large)[68] and black cattle began to frequent each others' pastures and stables, offering their calves to each other. In other words, the illicit mingling of the Sethite and Cainite lines is being described.[69] This would then be, arguably, an example of the straying-vs.-staying motif. If so, it is the only time in the Adam-to-Jacob section that color coding is supplemented by either of the other dominant motifs. Significantly, the straying involves *both* black and white cattle, rendering the inherent determinism of the color symbolism irrelevant in this case.

The first time the motif is used unambiguously is in the golden calf episode at Sinai (89:32–33), a passage quoted earlier (p. 71). While the lead sheep (Moses) is on the mountain, the sheep begin to go blind and they "stray from the path which had been revealed to them" (89:32). The lead sheep returns and finds that "a full majority of them are blind and straying off" (89:33). When the sheep see the lead sheep, they are frightened and want to return to their folds (89:34). After he has punished the flock, they fear even more, and Enoch then sees that the lead sheep "returned all the

---

Tiller, *A Commentary*, 380; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 405), but there is probably more to the image than that. See *Explanatory Comments* on 90:32 (pp. 227–228).

[67] Tiller (*A Commentary*, 237–238) understands this simply as the Cainites corrupting themselves, arguing that "large and black" simply means "large, black." But in that case the Sethites remain uncorrupted. Why then are only Noah and his family saved? (89:1).

[68] A few verses previous, Seth is described as a "large white bull," and his offspring are said to be like him (85:9). No such comment is made about the black.

[69] For a review of the motif of the mingling of the Sethites and Cainites and a comparison with the *An. Apoc*., see Klijn, "From Creation to Noah," 1.147–159.

flock that had strayed to their folds" (89:35).[70] In this episode, straying follows blindness, and the leader of the flock has the ability to return them to the fold, provided they wish it.

The next use of the motif is in a summary of the period of the judges: "At times their eyes were open and at other times blinded, until another lamb arose who led them and brought them all back again; and their eyes were opened" (89:41). Again the motif is used in tandem with seeing/blindness, and again a strong leader (Samuel) is able to bring the flock back into line, but in this case the return *precedes* the opening of the eyes.

The next time the motif is used is in the story of Saul (89:44–45). In these two verses the ram representing Saul is twice said to *leave his way* (= Gk) or *leave his glory* (= Eth), and once said to *depart from the way*. The only use of the blindness/seeing motif here is with regard to Samuel, whose eyes are opened so that he clearly sees the vagaries of Saul (89:44).[71] He responds by transferring leadership of the flock to David (89:46). This is the only instance of the straying motif in which the transgressing sheep is an individual rather than a group. Whether or not the blindness/seeing motif is in use may depend on the choice between Greek and Ethiopic. If Saul *leaves his glory*, this might allude to the fact that *open eyes* means *seeing the glory of Yahweh*, and it suggests that Saul has somehow lost sight of that glory.[72]

The last instances of going astray occur in the summary of the apostasy of the two kingdoms. With regard to the north, Enoch tells us that the flock "strayed off and followed diverse paths, and abandoned that house of theirs" (89:51). After the efforts of the prophets prove unfruitful (89:52–53), the south also apostatizes, and Enoch sees that the flock "abandoned the house of the Lord of the flock and his tower. They went utterly astray, and their eyes became blinded" (89:54). It is once again striking that blindness *follows* going astray.

Since the final examples of *going astray* involve abandoning Jerusalem and the Temple, it seems appropriate that the last examples of *staying-returning* occur with regard to dwelling in the New Jerusalem (90:28–36). The happy occupancy of this "house" is mentioned no less than three times. After the Lord of the flock builds the new abode (90:28–29a), the allegory

---

[70] The key phrase is preserved in 4Q*204* 4 8: [ון] לדיריה טעיתא ענא לכול דן אמרא אתיב.

[71] Again, Greek and Ethiopic diverge. In the Greek, a number of sheep open their eyes; in the Ethiopic, only one (Samuel). The Aramaic is not extant.

[72] For reasons to prefer the Eth, see *Translation Notes* on 89:44–45 (p. 179). In 1Sam 15:29, Samuel rebuffs Saul's pleas for clemency by telling him that "the Glory of Israel" does not change his mind.

notes that "all the sheep were in the midst of it" (90:29b). When the resurrected sheep and all the beasts and birds join them, we learn that "the Lord of the flock rejoiced with great joy because all of them had become good, and they had returned to his house" (90:33). The point is stressed once more, together with an equally strong stress on eyesight:

> 34b. And all of the flock enclosed themselves within that house, but it was not able to contain them. 35. And the eyes of all of them were open, and they saw beautifully; there was not one among them that did not see. 36. And I saw that the house had become large and spacious and very full.

If color coding speaks of determinism, straying or not straying speaks of freedom. A striking characteristic of straying is its *moral culpability*. It is strongly implied that willful choice is involved. The sheep in the golden calf episode do not simply go astray, they go astray in defiance of "the path which had been revealed to them" (89:32). The sheep who abandon the "house" (Jerusalem) and "tower" (temple), do so in hostile rejection of the prophets who are sent to warn them (89:51–54). Conversely, the fact that the sheep not only return, but *want* to return after the golden calf incident (89:34b–35) also points to a sense of moral responsibility based on choices originating in the will of the sheep. This element of autonomy may explain why it is that straying is sometimes capable of remedy through prophetic leadership (Moses and Samuel: 89:35, 41) and sometimes not (Elijah and other prophets: 89:52–53).

In our analyses of 90:6 and 90:32–35 above, we saw that when the eyesight motif and the color motif finally appear in proximity to each other, they appear to have some kind of tenuous relationship, but the nature of that relationship is left undefined. In contrast, there is a great deal of interplay between straying-vs.-staying/returning and the eyesight motif, but nevertheless that relationship too remains elusive. Sometimes blindness leads to straying (89:32–33), but at other times straying leads to blindness (89:52–53). On the positive side, returning to the proper place precedes the opening of the eyes for the sheep in the time of Samuel (89:41) and for the redeemed Gentiles in the New Jerusalem (90:33, 35). In the case of the redeemed sheep in the New Jerusalem, their proper location and superb eyesight are stressed together (90:34b–36). It is not easy to demonstrate a sequential relationship between their sight and their site, if there is one.

6. *The Three Dynamics*

What we find in examining the pallet of motifs used in the *An. Apoc*. for depicting positive and negative relationships with God is a flexible and sophisticated synthesis of three common understandings of human moral responsibility. The three can be described as *determinism*, *freedom*, and some form of cooperation, or *synergy*, between the two. In theological terms, the trilogy is often set forth as the predetermined will of God, the moral freedom of humans, and some kind of cooperative synthesis between divine and human wills. These are not rarefied concepts. The positions, and the arguments for them, are perennial and familiar to any student of theology or moral philosophy. Similar articulations of what is recognizably the same threesome can be found in both Jewish[73] and pagan[74] sources in antiquity, while modern discussions in this area often borrow vocabulary made popular in the theological battles of the Christian Reformation ("free will," "predestination").

In the *An. Apoc*., it is acknowledged that all three dynamics are relevant to understanding history. Color coding clearly witnesses to determinism as the explanation for some phenomena. Going astray and not going astray (or returning after a bout of straying) just as clearly witness to moral actions within the control of the animals who present such behaviors. But what of the eyesight motif? Does it lie within the power of the sheep to open their own eyes, or is this strictly an act of God? Are the sheep responsible for their own blindness, or is it something that is inflicted upon them? It can be argued that this motif represents the third option, a "both/and" cooperative act of divine and human wills.

---

[73] A well-known example is Josephus, who describes the three sects of the Jews as holding three positions: strict determinism (Essenes), complete freedom (Sadducees), and a middle position (Pharisees). "As for the Pharisees, they say that certain events are the work of Fate, but not all; as to other events, it depends upon ourselves whether they shall take place or not" (*Ant*. 13.171). Elsewhere, Josephus elaborates the latter position with regard to moral responsibility. The Pharisees "attribute everything to Fate and to God; they hold that to act rightly or otherwise rests, indeed, for the most part with men, but that in each action Fate co-operates" (*J.W*. 2.162–163).

[74] From the point of view of his pragmatic Stoicism, Marcus Aurelius describes a reasonable response to each of the three classic positions: "Either there is a fatal necessity and invincible order, or a kind of providence, or a confusion without a purpose and without a director. If then there is an invincible necessity, why do you resist? But if there is a providence which allows itself to be propitiated, make yourself worthy of the help of the divinity. But if all is confusion without a governor, be content that in such a tempest you have in yourself a certain ruling intelligence" (*Meditations* 12:14 [Haines, LCL]).

In the Ethiopic, the darkening of the eyes in the allegory is invariably expressed in a passive voice.[75] Nickelsburg surmises from this that an unstated demonic agent is responsible for the blindness of the sheep.[76] In light of the conspicuous presence of good and bad angels in the allegory, however, one wonders why the author of the allegory would be so coy about presenting this demon. The opening of the eyes is also passive in every case but two (89:28, 90:6). As it happens, Aramaic evidence survives for the former, showing that the Ethiopic is misleading here and that this passage too uses a passive construction.[77] One could speculate that a divine agent is responsible for the eye-openings,[78] but the text supplies no such hints. Furthermore, the Aramaic could simply mean that the eyes opened or closed, with no agent implied. At any rate, what does *not* occur anywhere in the text is an animal actively opening its own eyes or closing them.

Balancing this passivity is the fact that blindness can follow disobedience (89:54) and eye-opening can follow repentance (89:41), suggesting that moral choices and behavior can predispose a person to experience one state or the other. There must also be taken into account the allegory's studious avoidance of any direct connection between color and eyesight. No creature has its eyes opened because it is white, or darkened because it is not, suggesting that divine decree may not be the right tool for explaining the eyesight metaphor.

The opening and closing of eyes, then, is not presented as *merely* the result of either fate or free choice. The third dynamic, the cooperative blending of divine and human wills, best explains the data. Again, blindness leads to disobedience (89:32–33), but disobedience leads to blindness (89:54). Repentance and return leads to open eyes (89:41; 90:33, 35), but open eyes and obedience seem to enjoy a more simultaneous symbiosis as well (90:34–36). The allegory consistently avoids language that would encourage the conclusion that a particular agent or even a single agent lies behind either opening or closing of eyes. Whatever specific experience lies behind the opening of the eyes, the practical result is that it acts as a point of inter-

---

[75] As stated earlier (p. 65), the text uses either a passive verb (**ተጸለለ ፡** , 89:32, 41, 54; 90:7) or a passive participle (**ጽሉል ፡** , 89:33, 74).

[76] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 381.

[77] 4Q*206* 5 iii 17: ו]ועיניהון התפתח ("and their eyes were opened"). There is also fragmentary evidence for 89:32–33 which appears to support the Ethiopic passive constructions, even though the exact verbal root for blindness is uncertain. See VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes," 281–282.

[78] If Exod 4:11 is taken seriously, divine causation for the instances of blindness is equally credible.

connection between divine and human wills. Based on the wilderness vision of glory, as well as the connections to Enoch and to Jacob, one might venture to describe the opening of the eyes as an intense and direct awareness of God's presence, along with an awareness of God's relationship to those who see his glory, resulting in an acute awareness of who one is and how one should live. It is, in a word, *enlightenment*. Furthermore, as we have seen, this visionary experience enjoys a preeminence in that it is the universal criterion for judging every sentient being in the universe; not only Jews and Gentiles, but also angels.[79] Again, enlightenment is experiential and is related to obedience, but it should not be confused with it. Without enlightenment, one can hardly avoid sin, but enlightenment alone does not guarantee right behavior. It only enables it. In the language of the allegory, a blinded animal will almost certainly go astray, but a sighted animal will not *necessarily* stick to the right path. We have seen that in the allegory, blindness is sometimes the result of apostasy rather than its cause. When a sheep has its eyes open it can *see* the proper way, but it then has the choice of either following it or abandoning it.

7. *Conclusions*

"Salvation history" for the *An. Apoc*. lies in the future, when the Abrahamic covenant will be fulfilled through a restoration and perfection of humanity's original state. The bulk of history is not a record of *magnalia Dei* but a series of moral lessons, warning of the need for an authentic divine-human encounter in order to pass through the judgment into the Edenic world to come. Whether the readers look to Jacob or to Enoch (or to both) as their eponymous head, they see above all else someone who has been enlightened by a direct and immediate experience of the divine. The allegory refuses to classify this sort of eye-opening enlightenment as the product of either divine election or human effort, while acknowledging the roles both of these dynamics play in history.

The sophistication of the *An. Apoc*.'s presentation has not been fully appreciated, and this has sometimes led to extreme and simplistic interpretations. It has been argued that the allegory denies human freedom and

[79] The period of the rule of the 70 angel-shepherds, from the exile onward, is when we learn that blindness-vs.-sightedness is the principle that determines the fate even of the angels, since the 70 shepherds are said to be ignorant of God's will (89:61–64) and are explicitly said to act as they do because they are, in fact, blind (89:74).

therefore denies the covenantal principle, presenting a fatalistic universe.[80] Conversely, it has been argued that there is no determinism or fatalism in the *An. Apoc*. at all,[81] and that it presents so strong a case for human moral freedom that editors felt obliged to counterbalance it with another dream vision that reaffirms divine causality.[82] These opposing views both find supporting elements in the allegory, because the allegory attempts to do justice to the validity of both views, but in the end it affirms the universal supremacy of a "both/and" dynamic between God and the sentient creation.

[80] Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism*, 149, 155–156.
[81] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 48–49.
[82] Tite, "Textual and Redactional Aspects," 106–120.

CHAPTER THREE

LOOKING AT THE PRESENT: THE ALLEGORY IN ITS OWN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The *An. Apoc.* is an ambitious theological interpretation of the past, and it puts forth a bold vision of the future. But this statement was not spoken into a historical vacuum. There are a number of features of the *An. Apoc.* that are better explained not by the internal logic of its theological system, but by taking into account the time and place in which the *An. Apoc.* was composed and, more importantly, by examining the purposes this booklet may have been intended to serve, so far as these can be determined. There is no guarantee that the *An. Apoc.* actually performed as expected by the person or persons who produced and circulated it (although there is evidence to consider), but inquiries into the allegory's mission in its historical context may shed light on the allegory's unique presentation of human history. That is the purpose of this chapter.

Fortunately for the purposes of this study, there is no other Enochic writing that supplies better information about the circumstances of its composition. Fragments of the *An. Apoc.* from Qumran provide a *terminus ad quem* before 100 BCE,[1] but greater precision is possible since the allegory appears to describe the ascendancy of Judas Maccabee (90:9), but says nothing about his death (90:12). Based on this, most scholars agree that the *An. Apoc.* was written between 165–160 BCE,[2] and they further agree that the author was probably a member of or a sympathizer with the reform group

---

[1] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 61. The Qumran finds seem to have extinguished what once was a persistent minority view, first espoused by Dillmann, which maintained that the horned sheep of 90:10–11 is John Hyrcanus. See the survey in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 5–12, 62–63. A date during the reign of Hyrcanus (135/4–104 BCE) is not absolutely ruled out by the Qumran fragments; nevertheless the last serious attempt to argue the Hyrcanus hypothesis that I am aware of is Bo Reicke, "Official and Pietistic Elements of Jewish Apocalypticism," *JBL* 79 (1960), 137–150.

[2] Full analysis in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 61–79. Similar discussions and conclusions can be found in Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 180; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 44; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 161–163; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 77–78; and Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: A New English Version* (ed. G. Vermes et al.; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973–1987), 3:255. The only resistance to this consensus comes from scholars who postulate multiple layers of composition and argue that most of the *An.*

described in 90:6–9 and a supporter of the Maccabean revolt when it broke out, expecting it to evolve into earth's final battle, God's direct intervention in history, and the inauguration of the eschatological age (90:9–20). If this is correct, one may suppose that one reason the *An. Apoc*. was published was to encourage readers to back the Maccabean revolt.[3]

Recently, this view has been vigorously challenged by Daniel Assefa, who argues in his *L'Apocalypse des animaux* (*1Hen 85–90*)*: une propagande militaire?* that the *An Apoc*. is a pre-Maccabean work and that the "ram" of 90:9b–12, 16 is not Judas but a spiritual leader of the group behind the *An. Apoc*., possibly Enoch himself.[4] Assefa concedes that 90:13–15 refers to Judas, but he argues that these verses are a later interpolation, an admission that Judas should be recognized as an instrument of God. However, they depict him as rather exceptional, like an avenging angel.[5] The concerns of the group behind the *An. Apoc*. are wholly spiritual and preclude armed resistance to the Hellenists, who are accepted as instruments of God's just punishment.[6] In Assefa's view, the *An. Apoc*. advocates repentance and Torah faithfulness, and it is not militaristic or pro-Maccabean in either its original or interpolated forms.[7]

Even though I find Assefa's thesis unconvincing,[8] I believe he is correct in sensing a certain tension between the theology of the *An. Apoc*. and its advocacy for the Maccabean revolt. In terms of the present study, it is not immediately obvious how the allegory can maintain that there is no salvific historical program between the two Jacobs on the one hand, while rallying its readers to support the Maccabean uprising on the other.

Apoc. is an older work which was interpolated during the Maccabean period. So Goldstein, *IIMaccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 86 n. 16; idem, *IMaccabees* (AB 41; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 41–42 n. 12; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 361, 396–397; and Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 220–221. The various conjectures about multiple authorship and textual layers are all unnecessary, in my view, and they have no manuscript support.

[3] So, e.g., Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 182 ("… written by a Chasid in support of the Maccabean movment"); and Tiller, "Israel at the Mercy of Demonic Powers," 119 ("Fellow Judeans are called to spiritual vision and military resistance"). See also Tiller, *A Commentary*, 99.

[4] Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 220–232.

[5] Ibid., 233–236, 302.

[6] Ibid., 272.

[7] Ibid., 254–262, 282–289, 300–304, 328–334.

[8] Assefa's argument for a central concern with Torah in the *An. Apoc*. rests on his interpretation of "open eyes" as obedience to Law and Covenant, but that is probably not a valid interpretation of the image (see p. 68 above). There is much else in the allegory that contradicts his thesis. See the comments on Assefa's book in the *Introduction*, p. 10. For a full review, see Daniel C. Olson, review of Daniel Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux* (*1Hen 85–90*)*: une propagande militaire? Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*. *JSJ* 40 (2009), 76–77.

1. *Why Support the Revolt?*

According to the *An. Apoc.*, the cardinal issue at the last judgment is sight. Blinded Jews are condemned (90:26), and plausibly this criterion holds for the Gentiles as well (90:15, 18; cf. 89:21–27), as argued earlier (pp. 64–66). It follows that anything that might cause blindness threatens the very possibility of salvation. The allegory makes precisely such a claim with regard to the Greeks when it says that the birds of prey not only attack and devour the sheep, but they begin "pecking out their eyes" (90:2). In view of the central importance given to the symbol of eyesight in the allegory, it seems unlikely to me that this is only a bit of colorful imagery. Nickelsburg sees this as an example of "appropriate compensation," as the blinded eyes of the sheep are now pecked out.[9] This is possible, but it may not be the best reading of the blind/seeing trope as it is employed in the allegory. With each new episode of Israel's history, the sheep on stage should probably be regarded as neither wholly blind nor wholly sighted. Quite the contrary, it seems to be assumed throughout that there is a third, neutral state, not blind, but not possessed of extraordinary sight either. Blindness and the opened-eyed state are two possible departures from the common starting point of dull, mundane vision. For example, when the sheep in the wilderness first begin to open their eyes (89:28), there is no suggestion that they were blind before that. It also seems to be the case that if the sheep are utterly blind in one scene, that does not necessarily mean that they are utterly blind in the next. The blinded sheep of 89:54 nevertheless produce the well-meaning sheep of 89:72, but these fail in re-establishing the cult because they became blind in regard to such things (89:74). Thus, it is hazardous to assume that the eyes pecked out in 90:2 are supposed to be understood by readers as eyes that were already blinded, but even if they were, the violence of the birds suggests that nothing (or perhaps only an extraordinary miracle) can open the flock's eyes now.

By this image, which has no parallel elsewhere in the *An. Apoc.*, the allegorist may be imputing to the Greeks a unique *power to blind* beyond anything previously known. I use the term "Greeks" advisedly. The various Hellenistic dynasties are represented by four species of birds of prey. To say "Seleucid," the allegory says, "raven." To say "Macedonian," the allegory says, "eagle," and so on. What, then, is being said by "birds"? The *An. Apoc.* recognizes an essential underlying commonality among all Greeks and presents

[9] *1Enoch 1*, 395.

it in the one-to-one language of allegory as something we might call "bird-of-prey-ness" for want of a better term. At least part of this commonality is religious, since the Greeks in the allegory exercise a power that is apparently able to prevent Jews from having an authentic encounter with the divine, from "seeing the glory of God."

Militant resistance to the Greeks is presented in the allegory as something that evolves into a final battle and the eschatological advent of God (90:9–18), but significantly, military action is *not* presented as something that triggers that advent. The only human activity in this section that brings about divine intervention is *crying out* to God (90:13; cf. 90:11), precisely as in the days of the exodus (89:15–16). The duty to make war on the Greeks appears to be nothing more than an obligation to combat a dangerous spiritual force that is capable of damning Jewish souls. With his famous and much-debated persecutions, Antiochus Epiphanes did not only outlaw Judaism, he sought to *impose paganism* (2 Macc 6:1–9; 11:24; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:263).[10] The function or non-function of militant resistance to this wicked effort within some sort of imagined chain of historical events is irrelevant, except, perhaps, with regard to the imminence of the Last Judgment, which gives the resistance a special urgency. The fight is motivated not by the opportunity of moving the wheels of history, but by simple compassion. The allegory makes no attempt to hide this motive, as compassion for the suffering flock, despite its sins, is a prominent feature in the latter half of the allegory, with Enoch himself the most conspicuous empathizer (89:57, 69, 76; 90:3, 40–42).

It is harder to speak about the ill-fated armed revolt that precedes the Maccabean revolt (90:9a). As Tiller demonstrates, the horned lambs of 90:9a are not the Maccabee clan; that is, they are not the source from which Judas emerges in 90:9b. Rather, they are the reform group described in 90:6–8. These lambs sprout horns, but the horns are quickly crushed by the ravens.[11] To judge by the narrative flow, this reform group is galvanized into militancy by the assassination of Onias III, who is depicted as one of their own, a

[10] Here I follow Fergus Millar, "The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's 'Judaism and Hellenism,'" *JJS* 29 (1978), 1–21. Millar sees in the persecution of 167 an entirely pagan cult imposed by Antiochus's express will (ibid., 17–20). The great strength of Millar's case, over against the popular theories of scholars like Bickermann, Hengel, and Tcherikover, is that it gives greatest weight to the earliest reports, including what appear to be two contemporary documents referring to the imposition of "Greek customs" as the root of the conflict (2 Macc 11:24; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:263).

[11] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 354–355. See *Explanatory Comments* on 90:9 (pp. 212–213).

"young lamb" (90:8), if the usual interpretation of that verse is correct.[12] This sheds at least some light on the allegory's ideology. Priestly politics in the years leading up to the Maccabean revolt was dominated by the Oniad and Tobiad clans, and Onias III is remembered in 2 Maccabees as the one player who was pure of any Hellenizing trace.[13] The reform group of 90:6–7 may have hoped that their man Onias would lead the way to a purified Temple and reformed cult. If so, the group behind the *An. Apoc.* may have agreed with these reformers on many points, but this Enochic group did not identify entirely with the young lambs, since they regarded the Second Temple as defiled from its beginning (89:73) and anticipated no reform.[14] However, it is also possible that the identification between the two groups *was* total, and that the reformers claimed Onias as their own not because he was the potential key to a pure Temple but simply because he shared their anti-Hellenistic zeal. There is no need to suppose that the only ones interested in the character of the high priest were Jews with a strong spiritual investment in the Jerusalem Temple. The sheer political and cultural influence of the high priestly office during this period would have made the theological bent of its occupant a matter of importance even to Jews who may have given up on the Temple long ago.[15] In any event, the pre-Maccabean revolt failed, and so the allegory was not written in order to

---

[12] The assassination of Onias is depicted in 2 Maccabees as a major scandal (4:30–36), and the "anointed one" who is "cut off" in Dan 9:26 is generally identified as Onias, a reasonable conjecture since priests were the only "anointed ones" during this period. Most scholars think the seized lamb of *1 En* 90:8 represents a third reference to this crime, but not all are convinced. For a skeptical view, see especially Tiller, *A Commentary*, 352–354; and idem, "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 1–36; 81–108,'" in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck; JSJSup 80: Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2. 366–367.

[13] 2 Macc 3:1; 4:2; 15:12; see Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (trans. S. Applebaum; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959; repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 470 n. 41.

[14] The existence of a group behind the *An. Apoc.* is indicated by its self-conscious attachment to the existing Enochic tradition. As I hope to show presently, the work was probably not sent out without the company of interpreters, and it was very quickly accepted as an authentic Enochic writing.

[15] For the expansive role of the high priest in post-exilic times, see Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 119–120; and Schürer (Vermes), *History of the Jewish People*, 1:139, 193–194; 2:202–204, 227–228. It is for this reason that I find it difficult to agree with John J. Collins (*The Apocalyptic Imagination* [2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 69) and Jonathan Goldstein (*II Maccabees*, 240), who doubt that the seized lamb of 90:8 is Onias because they think he would be an unlikely martyr for an author who rejected the Second Temple. Perhaps an apt analogy would be the interest in the words and deeds of the Pope of Rome displayed by many followers of international politics today, even if they are not Roman Catholics.

rally support for it. For all we know, the group behind the *An. Apoc.* endorsed the first revolt for the same reason it now supported the Maccabean revolt: they saw it as a defense of the Jewish faith against a perceived spiritual assault.

2. *Suiting the Allegory to Service as Propaganda*

There are at least three features of the *An. Apoc.* that are not strictly required by the theology of the work but may be explained as elements which fit the allegory for service as propaganda for the Maccabean revolt. First, there is a strong concern about the *sin of fratricide* in the allegory. Second, the importance as well as the limitations of *good leadership* is a recurring theme. Third, the allegory has a remarkably *diplomatic quality* as it deals with the diversity of theological stances and eschatological hopes espoused by fellow Jews. It does not openly attack opposing views but disposes of them tactfully.

a. *The Sin of Fratricide*

The reform group with whom the allegorist identifies, or at least sympathizes (90:6–9), is depicted as vulnerable and rejected by most of their fellow Jews. If we follow Tiller in accepting the minority text of 90:7 as original, they are actually persecuted,[16] and in 90:16 the allegory anticipates lethal hostility from apostate Jews. Circumstances like these may explain the allegory's recurring interest in the dangers of fraternal hostility. The murder of Abel and its aftermath receive disproportionate attention in the account of the first generations of humanity (85:4, 6–7). The murder itself is described briefly, but an extra-biblical element is added in that Cain *pursues* Abel, with all the connotations of persecution the verb possesses across the relevant languages.[17] The threat of fraternal hostility also runs through the accounts of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph (89:10–13). Brief as these accounts are, each of the first three finds himself in the company of unfriendly siblings who quickly outnumber him.[18] Compared to these accounts, the story of Joseph's betrayal by his brothers is told in remarkable detail, including the fratricidal element of the story. Finally, the theme of fraternal hostility may also be an implicit element in an episode much later in the allegory. According to most scholars, 89:54 recalls king Ahaz's decision during the

[16] See *Translation Notes* on 90:7 (pp. 208–209).

[17] **ተለመ፡** = διώκω = רדף.

[18] See *General Comments* on 89:10–14 (pp. 165–167).

Syro-Ephraimite War (735–732) to hire Tiglath-pilesar, requesting that he save Judah by attacking Israel and Syria (2 Kgs 16:7–8). Within the narrative flow of the *An. Apoc*. this fratricidal act is presented as the final outrage before God abandons the flock (89:55).

b. *The Strengths and Limitations of Leadership*

If the allegorist hoped to convince fellow Jews that they should throw their support to Judas, he may have found that the Maccabee was not an easy sell to Jews who demanded that their saviors wear a recognizable uniform. Judas may have demonstrated military prowess and natural leadership skills, but he was not a Davidide, nor did he claim to be a prophet. He *did* come from a priestly family (1 Macc 2:1), but there is no evidence that he presented himself as a priestly figure or appealed to his pedigree for validation. The book of 1 Maccabees, written in the following century at least in part to legitimate the Hasmonean dynasty (see 1 Macc 5:62), deals with the strain of supporting a non-Davidic monarchy by depicting Judas as a new David *de facto* if not *de jure*.[19] In 2 Maccabees, Judas enjoys the explicit blessing of Jeremiah the prophet, directly from heaven (2 Macc 15:15–16). If any stratagem for promoting Judas is already underway in the *An. Apoc*., it is to present *good leadership* as credentials enough. The allegory depicts a wide variety of prominent characters from Israel's history as effective leaders, without tying this quality to any particular office.

The first effective leader predates Israel and is, ironically, a wicked one. Asael leads a coterie of angels into cohabiting with human women, with disastrous results (86:3). Being a strong leader is clearly insufficient. It is necessary to be a *righteous* leader also. In light of the Enochic interest in Jacob described in Chapter One, it is probably no coincidence that *he* is the first positive example of leadership in the allegory, *leading forth* his children to safety in Egypt (89:14). Moses is repeatedly described and depicted as a *lamb that leads* (89:28, 32, 37, 38), as are the sheep who rise up to take his and Aaron's places after they die (89:39). Samuel and the three kings of the united monarchy are likewise described and depicted as *leaders* (Samuel: 89:41; Saul: 89:42b; David: 89:46a; Solomon: 89:48b). In addition, David and Solomon are designated *rulers* (David: 89:45, 46; Solomon: 89:48b), perhaps indicating that the allegory recognizes that being a leader and being a king are not necessarily the same thing.

---

[19] John R. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Guide to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 70–71.

The allegory is quite clear that leadership cannot succeed without followership. There are instances when the stubbornness and defiance of the flock frustrate the efforts of even Israel's most skillful leaders. Moses is able to corral many but not all of the sheep (89:33–35), and Elijah and the prophets are simply no match for a stiff-necked flock (89:52–53).

All of these lessons would be applicable to an early Maccabean recruitment effort. Judas's righteousness counts as much as his obvious leadership skills, but even a gifted leader like he cannot succeed without willing followers. His seeming lack of credentials is no impediment: Israel's history demonstrates that divinely-appointed leadership is a charismatic quality that cuts across patriarchal, prophetic, and royal categories, being hostage to none of them.

c. *The Diplomatic Touch*

The persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes was apparently severe enough to bring together Jews with different beliefs and agendas in common support of Judas. A well-known example is the Hasidim, who gave their support to the Maccabees (1Macc 2:42) but were willing to make peace with the Syrians once a legitimate high priest was restored to office (1Macc 7:12–14).[20] If the success of the Maccabean revolt depended in part on its ability to hold together a coalition of Jews with diverse theological hopes, then it would not be surprising to find that a document intended to serve as a recruiting device would strike a diplomatic tone when dealing with stances different than its own. This is precisely what we find in the *An. Apoc*. There is evidence all through the allegory of great delicacy in dealing with Jews who invested their hopes in something other than the Abrahamic covenant favored by the Enochians. The allegory attaches no permanent or pivotal importance to the Mosaic covenant, the Davidic monarchy, or the Temple cultus, but it does not pick a fight with Jews who do. In fact, its diplomatic presentation is so successful that many readers have failed even to notice that these traditional channels of *Heilsgeschichte* are rejected by the allegory.[21]

The diplomacy of the *An. Apoc*. is already evident in its account of the earliest generations of humanity. Scholars have noted that there is a good deal

---

[20] On the diversity of motives behind the revolt, see Joseph Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (SFSHJ 6; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 37–38.

[21] See above pp. 57–60 for scholarly readings of the *An. Apoc*. as a champion of the Davidic throne (Goldstein, Chae), or of the Mosaic covenant (Reese, Assefa), or of the Temple cult (Bryan, Nickelsburg).

of extra-biblical *haggadic* material in *1 En* 85–86.[22] Some of these *haggada* could be explained as harmless concessions made by the Enochic author to traditions he did not necessarily embrace as part of the Enochic tradition, but which were not theologically objectionable. In two cases, however, scholars have detected the possible presence of traditions that may be described as *rivals* to the Enochic tradition. A number of later rabbinic and Gnostic texts maintain that Cain, and in some cases other children of Adam and Eve, were actually fathered by demons. There are also later traditions maintaining that the wicked Cainites seduced and intermingled with the elect Sethites, and that it was this corruption that brought on the Flood.[23] Neither of these interpretations of Genesis fits comfortably within the Enochic tradition. In the one case, a demonic invasion is presented prior to the fall of the Watchers, robbing that event of its primal significance. In the other case, an alternative interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 is presented, resulting in an alternative explanation for the Flood.[24] If these traditions were current in the time of the *An. Apoc.*, the author in retelling the biblical narrative would have had to decide whether to disappoint and possibly offend Jews who held these interpretations or else find a way to accommodate them. Wishing to enlist as many as possible in the cause of the revolt, the allegory appears to have chosen the latter course. A.F.J. Klijn and George Nickelsburg think that the demonic paternity of Cain is implied by his blackness, and that the demonic paternity of the other children of Adam and Eve may be implied in *1 En* 85:8: "And later she [Eve] bore another white bull [Seth], and after him many bulls and heifers, black ones." They also see—correctly in my opinion—the intermingling of Sethite and Cainite lines in 86:2: "After that I looked at the large and the black cattle, and behold they all changed their pastures, their stables, and their calves; and they began to moan with each other."[25] Even if Klijn and Nickelsburg are correct, one might ask why the text is not more explicit. It may be that the ambiguity is deliberate. Jewish readers who believe that Cain was the son of Sammael or that the mingling of the Cainite and Sethite lines was a major antediluvian scandal will probably read this re-telling of Genesis with those

---

[22] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 186 ("at times mythical elements from later Jewish exegesis are incorporated"); See especially Klijn, "From Creation to Noah," 1.147–159; and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 371–373.

[23] For details about these traditions, see below, p. 149 n. 12 and p. 151 n. 15.

[24] According to this traditional exegesis, the Sethites are the "sons of God" and the Cainites are the "daughters of humanity" in Gen 6:1–2. No angels are involved.

[25] Klijn, "From Creation to Noah," 151–154; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 356, 371, 373, 380–381. The verb "moan" is somewhat problematic: see *Explanatory Comments* on 86:2 (pp. 153–154).

presuppositions in mind, and when they do, they may well find these traditions in the ambiguous language of the *An. Apoc*., just as Klijn and Nickelsburg do. Other Jews (including Enochians) who care nothing for those traditions, or are even hostile to them, will see nothing in the text that necessarily affirms either one. If Cain and some of his siblings are born black, does that necessarily imply anything about their paternity? Cattle are regularly born in one of three colors in this era, with no explanation offered. The writer may be leaving a door open to a demonic interpretation of the black offspring, but if so, he has done it without committing himself. Furthermore, by placing the account of the intermingling of Cainites and Sethites—if that is what it is—within the story of the fall of the Watchers (86:1–87:1), the allegorist opens another door to a harmonizing synthesis between the two rival traditions for those who need such a synthesis in order to own this text. It is noteworthy that in *no other text* will the "Sethite" and the "Angel" interpretations of Gen 6:1–4 stand harmoniously side by side as they do in the *An. Apoc*. This analysis must remain tentative, since there is no direct evidence that either tradition, demon seed among Adam and Eve's children or the Sethite reading of Gen 6:1–4, existed as early as the *An. Apoc*.; but if they did, and if the above analysis is correct, then this passage of the allegory is a diplomatic *tour-de-force*.

The allegory faces a more formidable challenge in dealing with the Mosaic covenant. The *An. Apoc*. does not assign to Sinai the central place that many Jews undoubtedly gave it. At one point, the allegory *does* use language that suggests a high regard for the Torah, chiding the flock for straying from "the path which had been revealed to them" (89:32), but it supplies no information about what this path is or when it was revealed. The main strategy for dealing with Jews who define their faith by the Mosaic covenant, however, is to heap praise on Moses as a great and glorious leader. God personally calls him, and Moses immediately accepts, confronting the wolves with a warning not to harm the flock (89:17–18). As previously noted, his leadership role after the exodus is mentioned no less than four times (89:28, 32, 37, 38). He alone is able to stand in the terrifying presence of God (89:28–32), and the allegory explicitly absolves him of responsibility for the misbehavior of the flock while he is gone (89:32b). He is a strong and effective disciplinarian, and the sheep hold him in awe (89:34–35). So great is Moses that he achieves angelic status and builds a house for the Lord (89:36).[26] When he dies, the flock is grief-stricken (89:34b–35a). All of this

[26] Even here, a certain diplomatic elusiveness may be in evidence, since the allegory neglects to say whether Moses' angelic status is a permanent transformation.

flattery was not without effect, apparently. Writing within a decade or less after the publication of the *An. Apoc*., the book of *Jubilees* alludes to it as an authentic Enochic writing and apparently approves of it (*Jub* 4:19), even though *Jubilees* is a champion of the Mosaic covenant.[27]

David is dealt with in similar fashion. He is a superlative military success and both a leader and a ruler (89:46, 48a, 49). Thanks to him, the flock enjoys safety from both personal attacks and from robbery, and their numbers swell (89:49). Under David and his son Solomon, the flock enjoys a golden age, with Jerusalem thriving, the Temple built, and the Lord himself present among the happy flock (89:50). In short, the period of David and Solomon is depicted as the highest point in Israel's history.[28] We may excuse readers who pinned their hopes on a restoration of the house of David if they thought that the *An. Apoc*. was friendly to their outlook. But credit for the spiritual health of the flock during this period goes not to the kings but to Samuel's reforms at its beginning (89:41). David is credited with supplying a safe environment for the golden age, but nothing else. Solomon is silently robbed of all credit for the flourishing of the city and the erection of the Temple, which are described in passive verbal constructions. As argued in Chapter One (pp. 26–27), the allegorist evidences no interest in the monarchy *per se*.

Jerusalem cultists are treated to the same tactics. As Nickelsburg points out, the *An. Apoc*. demonstrates a consistent interest in the Tabernacle and the Temple,[29] and the roles of Aaron and the Levites are fully acknowledged in the accounts of the exodus and wilderness periods (89:18, 31, 35, 37). According to the allegory, the First Temple was glorious, but the service of the Second Temple is invalid (89:50, 73). Of course, the *An. Apoc*. is not the only text from the Second Temple period that finds fault with that temple and believes its offerings are unacceptable, but it may well be the only text that says so without explaining why.[30] A variety of possible reasons why the *An. Apoc*. rejects the Second Temple have been offered,[31] but the possibility should be considered that the silence is intentional. The service

---

[27] See John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 226–227 ("… the Mosaic covenant … provides a focal point for Israel's history, a prism through which all of Jewish existence and community structures must be viewed"). For more on *Jubilees* and the *An. Apoc*., see below, pp. 108–110.

[28] "According to this vision, the united monarchy was the one period in Israel's history that was not characterized by national apostasy" (Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 383).

[29] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 355–356.

[30] In contrast to, e.g., Malachi 1; CD v–vi; 1QpHab ix 4–6; xii 7–10; 4QMMT; and *Ps. Sol*. 8:11–13.

[31] See *Explanatory Comments* on 89:73 (pp. 199–200).

of the Second Temple in the years leading up the Maccabean revolt could be and was rejected on many grounds, ranging from *halakhic* imprecision to use of the wrong calendar to illegitimate priestly lines to scandalous priestly misconduct. Not all Jews would agree with the *An. Apoc.* that the Temple has been on the wrong footing since it was built, but a variety of them would have agreed that it is in an unacceptable state at present. Violent resistance to the blasphemous campaign of Antiochus (2Macc 6:1–9) held out the promise of purifying the Temple at last, and Judas himself seemed cognizant of and sympathetic to this motivation (1Macc 4:36–59). So when the *An. Apoc.* declares the Temple offerings "polluted and impure," readers are left to define that pollution and impurity in accordance with their own views. One wonders how many of those same readers noticed that the allegory never returns to this theme and is silent about whether there is a temple in the eschatological kingdom.

Finally, we have seen that there is a persistent tendancy within the Enochic tradition to present Enoch as a shadow or twin of Jacob. In Chapter One I argued that the two men follow similar scripts as visionaries, and in Chapter Two I argued that they both serve as exemplars of an authentic encounter with the divine. But in the *An. Apoc.*, as we have seen, such parallels are relegated to the narrative framework and *not* incorporated into the allegory itself. As the story of Israel unfolds, what we see onstage is the mystery of Jacob and his future glorification, representing the extinction and the eventual rebirth of Adamic humanity. That plot is uncomplicated by parallels with Enoch. This too is diplomatic. Jews who identified themselves as children of Israel but not necessarily as children of Enoch would have found nothing objectionable in this Enochic survey of history. Jacob is unique and central. The allegorist is careful not to focus on Enoch at the expense of Jacob.[32]

---

[32] If the epilogue to the "Parables" is original and Enoch is the Son of Man (71:14), then we see that by the time of that writing, the bond of identity between Enoch and the Enochians was as absolute as the one between the Chosen Servant of Deutero-Isaiah and the "servants" and "chosen ones" of Trito-Isaiah, or between the Son of Man and the "holy ones of the most high" in Daniel (see pp. 29–30 above). The Son of Man in the "Parables," also called the "Chosen One" and the "Righteous One," has his earthly counterpart in the "congregation" of "the chosen," "the righteous," and "the holy" (38:1; 41:2; 45:1; 46:8; 53:6; 62:8). However, it is difficult to find a linkage quite so direct in the earlier Enochic writings, and the *An. Apoc.*'s willingness to defer to an over-arching Israelite identity in Jacob may represent either an earlier or a variant Enochic theology, or perhaps it is to be explained by an understanding of the two men as avatars of the same heavenly personality and therefore in no competition with each other. For the merging of identities in Jewish "heavenly double" traditions, see Andrei Orlov, "The Heavenly Counterpart of Moses in the Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and*

In brief, the *An. Apoc*. shows great tact in dealing with diverse theological views and hopes. In making its own bold statement about the nature of history and the centrality of the Abrahamic promise, the allegory disposes of incompatible views in such a way as to make as few enemies as possible. This approach is a credible strategy for a document that seeks to win wider support for a cause that needs to increase its numbers.

3. *Establishing a Two-Fold Authority*

None of this effort would have been of any use, of course, if the *An. Apoc*. were unable to win a hearing. The apocalypse presents itself as a revelation from God, handed down in the form of a written document which the reader now reads (or hears being read). There is nothing to indicate that this presentation is done with ironic intent. The *An. Apoc*. therefore lays claim to a great deal of authority. This authority rests on two pillars, one explicit and the other implicit.

a. *The Authority of Enoch*

Explicitly, the writing invokes the authority of Enoch, the antediluvian patriarch who walked with God. Enoch related his vision orally to his son Methuselah (85:2), who presumably wrote it all down, and a copy has now come to light. For readers willing to accept these claims at face value, the *An. Apoc*. probably has all the credibility it needs. Such readers would include self-conscious subscribers to the Enochic tradition, but perhaps other Jews as well, who might not consider themselves "Enochians," but nevertheless, for whatever reasons, found that this booklet's claims were credible. It is clear from contemporary writings like Sirach and *Jubilees* that some Jews who stood outside the Enoch tradition nevertheless accorded a great deal of respect to Enoch the man and, in the case of *Jubilees*, respect also for the Enochic writings (Sir 44:16; 49:14; *Jub* 4:16–26).[33] The earliest Enochic

---

the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 131–144.

[33] For the many contrasts between *1 Enoch* and Sirach, see Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995). Argall discusses the complex textual difficulties of Sir 44:16 and 49:14 and concludes that Ben Sira displays "appreciation for traditions about Enoch" (*1 Enoch and Sirach*, 9–13 [13]). For the attitude of *Jubilees* toward the *An. Apoc*., see pp. 108–110 below.

writings, the "Book of the Watchers" and the "Astronomy Book," lean entirely on this pillar. Enoch enjoyed unique access to the secrets of heaven, and so his testimony is uniquely authoritative (*1 En* 1:2; 19:3; 72:1; 79:6; 82:1–3). But in the case of these older books, if Enochic authorship were to be questioned or denied, readers would have little obligation to give heed to the voice they heard speaking through the text. They could take it or leave it.

b. *The Authority of Scripture and History*

The *An. Apoc*. does not put all of its weight on the single pillar of Enochic authorship, but adds to it a second pillar: an implicit appeal to the *authority of scripture* (from Creation to the Second Temple) and to *post-biblical historical records and common memory* (from the Second Temple to the present). I would caution against any tendency to view these two appeals as utterly distinct, as if one were an appeal to "sacred" writings and the other to "secular" history. The biblical narrative of Genesis through Kings is treated as an accurate historical record on the one hand, and on the other hand the *signifying* ability of "secular" events in the post-biblical period is the result of divine designation in the form of a revealed pattern, as will be explained below. The events unfold under a plan designed by God. Furthermore, these events ultimately fulfill a prophecy in Jeremiah, returning the whole to a biblical base.

A case can (and will) be made that the appeal to scripture-and-history is another tool in service of the allegory's role as propaganda for the Maccabean revolt, much like the features already discussed above. From this perspective, the appeal is an attempt to gain a wider hearing for the *An. Apoc*., beyond the circles of those who are fully satisfied that the vision really originates with Enoch. However, it may also be said that there is more to this appeal than political calculation. The allegory is presenting a full accounting for human history as part of its theological *raison d'être*, and if that is so, then there is hardly any way it can avoid the claim that truth can be seen in history, quite apart from finding truth in the raw prophetic authority of the purported author. The second appeal is useful, but given the nature of the entire project, it is also inevitable.

What is this implicit appeal to scriptural authority? From Genesis to Kings, the allegorist has the luxury of paraphrasing a text that both he and his readers probably accept as scripture. It is common ground. So long as the historical panorama foreseen by Enoch strikes the reader as a reasonable and pious presentation of what is found in that holy writ, that holy writ returns the favor by validating Enoch's prophecy to some

degree.[34] Very simply, what Enoch has foreseen is something the readers *already know is true*. This constitutes a separate appeal alongside the appeal to Enochic revelation. Even if some readers harbor doubts about the Enochic authorship of this newly discovered apocalypse, they may choose to bracket those doubts and simply evaluate the author's handling of scripture. If they find the implied exegesis that speaks through this fresh rehearsal of the sacred story to be sound and persuasive, the book wins at least a measure of respect. The sermon is good, even if one cannot fully vouch for the preacher.

It is easy to see the value of this second pillar in winning support for the Maccabean revolt. If the book is going to have a useful impact, that impact must be an immediate impact. There can be no waiting for the *An. Apoc.* to build a reputation over time. By incorporating the genre of "Rewritten Scripture," its promoters may reasonably expect an immediate hearing on that basis.[35]

But this borrowed validation expires at approximately 560 BCE (2 Kgs 25:27–30). There is no running scriptural narrative covering the later Babylonian, Persian, or Hellenistic eras. There are data at hand for the return from Exile and the rebuilding projects (Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, 1 Esdras), but aside from that isolated patch there is only what may be gleaned from stories about some notable individuals, and even some of these texts may have had dubious credentials as scripture (Esther, Tobit, Dan 1–6). If Enoch's account is going to continue to ring true with those readers who may have lingering doubts about Enochic authorship, some new form of legitimization is required at this point.

The problem of an incomplete biblical record was felt by more writers than just the author of the *An. Apoc.*, of course. In order to bridge the knowledge gap between Ezra and the latter Hellenistic period, many Jewish authors adopted the strategy seen in Dan 9:24–27, which consists of septupling Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 years of bondage (Jer 25:11; 29:10). Already in 2 Chr 36:21, the 70 years of Jeremiah are linked to Lev 26:31–35, 43 and

---

[34] The simple fact that this apocalypse requires no interpreting angel is evidence that the author anticipates a readership that is already deeply familiar with the biblical narrative.

[35] "Rewritten Scripture" is currently the preferred term for a genre originally identified by Geza Vermes in 1961 and titled by him, "Rewritten Bible." See Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 67–126. Although some scholars have raised objections to it, the genre title continues to be used and useful. For a recent survey of the literature and review of the issues, see Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," *JBL* 131/2 (2012), 271–288. (Zahn herself defends "Rewritten Scripture" as a legitimate literary genre.)

understood as sabbatical years, opening the door to an interpretation of the 70 years as 70 *weeks* of years.[36] This provides a chronological framework in which to place whatever scraps of data for the Persian and early Hellenistic eras lay at hand.[37]

The *An. Apoc.* is one of the texts that takes advantage of this system. In order to introduce it, the narrative abruptly changes its focus from earthly to heavenly events in the period leading up the final Babylonian conquest (89:59–64). God abandons the sheep to the care of 70 "shepherds" (angels),[38] and he commands a heavenly auditor to carefully and secretly monitor the activities of these shepherds, who will certainly treat the flock with excessive harshness. Each of them is allotted one "time" or "hour" (89:59, 65, 68, 72; 90:1). As the narrative unfolds, it becomes apparent that these 70 periods are grouped into four segments, using a 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 pattern (89:59, 72; 90:1, 5, 20).[39] The 70 periods are more than sufficient to finish out the historical review of the allegory, ending when God steps in to inaugurate the eschatological age. By this point the allegory is comfortably within living memory of author and audience, and the historical review has become contemporary reportage.

The *theological* purposes of this new element in the allegory are not mysterious and are routinely discussed in the commentaries. It is widely agreed that the rule of the 70 wicked angels serves to defend God's reputation against the open admission that Israel's exilic and post-exilic punishment has exceeded Israel's sins (Isa 40:2; Jer 16:18; Zech 1:15; Psalm 79). It is not God but wicked angels who are responsible for the excess. At the same time, the scrupulous monitoring and the preordained time frame demonstrate that God has not lost control of the situation and that justice will eventually prevail.[40] The 70 angels also provide a counterpart to the Watchers of Enoch's

---

[36] See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 479–489.

[37] On this, see Lester L. Grabbe, "Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography," *SBLSP* 2 (1979), 43–68 (55).

[38] There is no longer any serious dispute that the shepherds are angels. For a history of the problem and its resolution, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 51–52. The only scholars known to me who still maintain that the shepherds are human are Stephen B. Reid ("1 Enoch: The Rising Elite of the Apocalyptic Movement," *SBLSP* 22 [1983], 147–155 [154]) and Philip Tite ("Textual and Redactional Aspects," 112), neither of whom present any substantial arguments.

[39] Some German scholars opt for a 23 + 12 + 23 + 12 pattern: Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 35; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.187; Müller, *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apocalyptik*, 111–113; and Ego, "Vergangenheit," 177. This view should be rejected, however, because the 23 + 12 + 23 + 12 pattern is based entirely on a misunderstanding of እምኔሁ፡ in 89:72a (see *Translation Notes* on 89:72a [p. 193]).

[40] The best discussion is in Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 200–201; but similar analysis is in Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 231–232; Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 35; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 272; Tiller, *A*

day, reinforcing the typical Enochic typology between the days of Noah and the present world. Just as a contingent of wicked angels let loose a torrent of evil before the first world judgment, so again another group is doing something similar before the second.[41]

In contrast, the possibility that the period of the 70 governing angels may serve a *historiographical* purpose within the *An. Apoc*. is rarely discussed, except to deny that it serves any such purposes. Emil Schürer, the scholar who presented the first real argument that the shepherds were angels and not humans, warned that the four symmetrical periods (12 + 23 + 23 + 12) represent only a "short-long-long-short" pattern adapted rather loosely to historical events.[42] By the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, scholars were routinely characterizing the 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 sequence as "arbitrary and unhistorical."[43] This attitude still prevails among contemporary scholars, who continue to insist that the four epochs have little to do with "real" history.[44]

Against this view, I am suggesting that the 70 angel-shepherds serve an urgent, pragmatic need on the part of the allegorist. They may be part of the theodicy of the allegory, but they are not *merely* in the service of theodicy. It is this pragmatic need that has driven the allegorist to match the angel periods to historical events as accurately as possible. The effort

---

Commentary, 58, 330; and most recently Beato Ego, "The Hellenistic Crisis as Reflected by the Animal Apocalypse: Aetiological and Eschatological Aspects," in *Judaism and Crisis: Crisis as a Catalyst in Jewish Cultural History* (ed. A. Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld, and M. Weigold; SIJD 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 75–87 (83) ("God is acquitted").

41 Tiller, *A Commentary*, 18, 52–53.

42 Emil Schürer, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1874), 531–532; idem, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (*175 B.C. A.D. 135*) (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1886), 3:65 ("For every calculation pretending to chronological exactness must be radically erroneous").

43 So Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 238. For similar remarks, see, e.g., Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 218 ("il est impossible de prouver que, dans les détails, elle répond exactement à la chronologie réelle"); Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 201 ("No system … can arrive at any but a forced explanation of these numbers"); and James A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1927), 395 ("the arbitrary character of this numerical series is obvious").

44 See, e.g., Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 21 ("arbitrary and indeterminate"); Tiller, *A Commentary*, 59, 338 ("the number of shepherds has no real relation to the length of a given period"); Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyJ* 17 (1976), 257 ("arbitrary"; "the author was not really concerned with the actual changes on the world scene"); Fröhlich, *"Time and Times,"* 88 ("This schema … has nothing to do with historical reality"); and Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen, und Jubiläen*, 226 ("chronologische Details keinen Platz haben"). Two exceptions to this consensus are Roger T. Beckwith, "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," *RevQ* 10 (1980), 182–184; and Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 544–545.

was necessary in order to insure that the credibility of the allegory would not lapse as it moved into the post-biblical period. The allegorist has enhanced the historical reliability of the *An. Apoc*. through a unique combination of two distinct historical-literary conventions: the 490-year model and the four-empire model.

As already mentioned, outlines of history using some form of heptadic system were common in the period in which the *An. Apoc*. was written.[45] A schema of 490 years from the exile to the beginning of eschatological salvation appears most famously in Dan 9:24–27, but it also underlies 11Q*Melchizedek* (11Q13 ii 6–8), 4Q*Apocryphon of Jeremiah* (4Q*390*),[46] probably *The Damascus Document* (CD i 5–6),[47] and *T. Levi* 16–17.[48] If the "times" of the 70 shepherds in the *An. Apoc*. are seven years each (equivalent to the "weeks" of Dan 9:24–27), then *1 En* 89:59–90:19 is another text that uses the 490-year model, and virtually all *1 Enoch* scholars agree that this is the case. All of the works that are known to use the exile-to-eschaton, 490-year model subdivide the 70 year-weeks, but no two do it in the same way:[49]

Dan 9:24–27:	$(7\times7) + (62\times7) + 7 =$	490
Damascus Document:	$390 + 20\ [+\ 40] + 40 =$	490
11Q*Melchizedek*:	$(9\times49) + 49 =$	490
4Q*Apocryphon of Jeremiah*:	$70 + (7\times49) + 7 + 70 =$	490
T. Levi 16–17:	$(70\times7) = (49\times10) =$	490
Animal Apocalypse:	$(12\times7) + (23\times7) + (23\times7) + (12\times7) =$	490

[45] The most detailed and recent study is Berner's.

[46] See Devorah Dimant, "4QApocryphon of Jeremiah: Introduction," in *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts*, part 4 (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 91–260 (113–115); and Hanan Eshel, "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 102–110.

[47] To the 390 years mentioned in CD-A i 5–6 are added the 20 years of subsequent wandering (CD-A i 9–10), 40 years of ministry by the Teacher of Righteousness (not mentioned explicitly, but a stereotypical number), and the 40 years between his death and the coming redemption (CD-B xx 13–15), for a total of 490. This widely-accepted analysis of the *Damascus Document* was first suggested by F.F. Bruce (*The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* [London: Tyndale, 1957], 16–17).

[48] Note that these are only the works complete enough to bear examination. There are other, more fragmentary works that are suspected of using the 490-year system (e.g., 4Q*180–181* [*Pesher on the Periods*]; 4Q*243* [*Pseudo-Daniel*]). See Dimant, "4QApocryphon of Jeremiah," 114; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 57. I am not including works here that extend a heptadic model to include all of history, like *Jubilees* or the *Apoc. of Weeks* (*1 En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17).

[49] Cana Werman, "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *DSD* 13,2 (2006), 229–255 (253). For the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* schema, see also Eshel, "4Q390," 107.

The 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 pattern, then, is not part of the convention. Its explanation is to be found in the four-empire model, best known from Daniel 2 and 7, but found also in 4Q*552–553* (*Four Kingdoms*), the *Fourth Sibylline Oracle*, and in Persian and Roman sources.[50] The most common view is that the four empires of the *An. Apoc.* represent (1) the Babylonian period (89:65–72a); (2) the Persian period (89:72b–90:1a); (3) the Greek-Ptolemaic period (90:1b–5); and (4) the Greek-Seleucid period (90:6–19).[51]

The advantage in combining these two models is that it potentially provides verification for *this* particular 490-year pattern by linking it to a few well-known public events situated at non-random intervals. All that is needed to evaluate the system is one securely datable event in the allegory at one of its four junctions, and the grid of 84 + 161 + 161 + 84 years will fall into place automatically over the four empires. At least in theory, if the resultant dates seem significant beyond what could be reasonably attributed to coincidence, then there is no need to accept the pattern by faith, and once again the proponents of the *An. Apoc.* are standing safely on grounds where it is not strictly necessary to accept Enochic authorship. Readers would find the *An. Apoc.* credible as a revelation to *somebody* simply because it correctly reveals a previously unknown pattern that fits what is objectively known to be true.

The datable event occurs at the very beginning of the second period, which tells how three sheep began to rebuild the city and the temple (89:72b–73a). The three sheep are Zerubbabel, Joshua, and (probably)

---

[50] The four-kingdom model appears in the Zoroastrian apocalypse *Bahman Yasht* and in a fragment of Aemilius Sura preserved in a turn-of-the-era Latin author, Velleius Paterculus. See Collins, *Daniel*, 166–167. Aemilius Sura is otherwise unknown.

[51] So Tiller (*A Commentary*, 55, 324–366). Others who take this position include Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 202–212); Montgomery (*Book of Daniel*, 391, 395); Knibb ("The Exile," 256); Dimant ("Qumran Sectarian Literature," 544–545); Black (*Book of Enoch*, 79–81); Bryan (*Cosmos*, 53); Collins (*Apocalyptic Imagination* [2nd ed.], 69); and Olson ("Historical Chronology after the Exile according to 1 Enoch 89–90," *JSP* 15.1 [2005], 63–74). Some scholars differ only in that they think the third period covers the entire Greek experience to date, so that the fourth period commences from the author's own day, that is, early in the Maccabean revolt. So García Martínez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 74–75); and Helge S. Kvanvig (*Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* [WMANT 61; Neukerchen-Vluyn: Neukerchener Verlag, 1988], 105). There are also some minor variations in the exact textual parameters proposed for the four sections. At present, the major dissenter from this system is Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 391–393), who sees the 70-shepherd period beginning with the reign of Manasseh (687–642 BCE), with the cardinal events of each of the four periods falling in the middle rather than the end of each. Thus, the four periods are: (1) from Manasseh to the exile, (2) from the return to Alexander, (3) from Alexander into the second century, and (4) from that point until the end of time. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 60) criticizes Nickelsburg's analysis as speculative and indemonstrable.

Sheshbazzar,[52] and the year they began their rebuilding is abundantly and unanimously attested in the tradition as the second year of Darius, or 520 BCE (Hag 1:1–2,15; 2:1–2; Ezra 4:24–5:2,14–16; 1Esd 2:30; 6:1–22). If the second period begins in 520, the other dates fall into place according to the allegory's 84+161+161+84 schema as follows:

Year	Marks the beginning of	*1Enoch*
604	Babylonian era	89:65–72a
520	Persian era	89:72b–90:1a
359	Greek-Ptolemaic era	90:1b–5
198	Greek-Seleucid era	90:6–19

As I have argued elsewhere, these dates are all defensible as markers for these four eras.[53] The allegorist has evidently taken extraordinary pains to locate significant events and dates that conform a four-empire sequence to a symmetrical, 490-year, exile-to-eschaton system.

There is an odd feature to this system: *It is not obvious, and it seems deliberately so*. First, there is no mention of the four sections anywhere in the allegory. Only the 70 periods are mentioned; the four subdivisions are only detectable because there is a ritual audit and/or a tally of expired periods at the conclusion of each of them.[54] It would be easy for a reader to miss the four-part model entirely, even though it is a demonstrable feature of the text once it is noticed. Why has the allegorist run the risk that readers might not notice the four sections at all? Second, the allegory gives no hint that the heavenly audits trigger earthly events, or vice versa. After all the trouble the allegorist must have gone to in order to find a set of four events that match up symmetrically in a heptadic, 490-year scheme, one might expect the allegory to highlight the events occurring at all four junctures and expressly link the heavenly audits to them, but it is not so. In fact, for the years 359 and 198 no earthly events are described at all. The historical verification of the allegory's blueprint can only emerge as the result of careful exegetical effort. Possibly this is a clue to the original target audience of the *An. Apoc*.

---

[52] For Sheshbazzar vs. Nehemiah, see *Explanatory Comments* on 89:72 (pp. 198–199).

[53] Jer 25:1; 2Chr 36:22; Ezra 1:1; and Dan 1:1–2 all begin the exile in 604/5; temple reconstruction began in 520; Philip II took the throne of Macedonia in 359 (three years before the birth of Alexander); and Antiochus III took control of Jerusalem in 198. See Olson, "Historical Chronology," 69–74. Dimant ("Qumran Sectarian Literature," 544–545) previously arrived at a very similar conclusion by a different path.

[54] The Babylonian, Persian, and Seleucid eras all end with both an audit and an announcement of the number of expired periods (89:71–72a; 89:76–90:1a; 90:17). The Macedonian-Ptolemaic era also ends with a tally of periods, but for some reason it lacks the audit (90:5).

One scenario that would explain these features is that the author of the *An. Apoc*. wished to garner support among the educated leadership in Jerusalem for the fledgling Maccabean revolt. The situation was urgent; it would not do to simply wait for a fresh literary work to accrue authority over time. To that end, the Enochic author published an apocalypse that did not have to immediately convince all readers that it was really an ancient writing in order to be accepted as a genuine revelation. But books do not promote themselves. Some person or group (presumably Enochians) presented the *An. Apoc*. to a particular readership. Perhaps those who first presented the writing would also have had "talking points" to go with it, sufficient historical materials to demonstrate the accuracy of Enoch's dates. If such material had been included in the apocalypse itself, the strategy of the allegory would have been clumsy and obvious. Better to present it separately, as the *fruit of exegesis*. All of the necessary outside data could be gathered up with the use of comparative tables of dating systems such as Jerusalem diplomats would have needed in order to do their work, and with the use of Greek historical writings of the kind that contemporaries of the *An. Apoc*. were certainly reading, if we may judge by the evidence of Daniel 11. The accuracy of Enoch's predictions is not obvious but requires careful comparison with known historical events. Once this is done, however, the quality of the prophecy is impressive. There will always be an educated mindset for which a secret code that unfolds with startling and coherent results holds a power that a more overt kind of presentation cannot match.

Going after this type of reader was a sensible strategy. Time was limited, so the *An. Apoc*. aimed to win over those men who had broad public influence when it came to questions of scriptural interpretation or the authenticity of documents claiming divine revelation. Those would be the scribes. The type of skills necessary to produce a work like the *An. Apoc*. suggests that the allegorist himself was a scribe, and it would have made sense to try to convince fellow scribes that the *An. Apoc*. was a trustworthy revelation. Their endorsement would carry weight in synagogues and on the street.[55]

---

[55] Working with the evidence provided by Sirach and the "Admonitions of Enoch" (*1 En* 91–105), Richard Horsley presents a convincing case that in Hellenistic Judaism the scribal class existed at a mid-level between poor, ordinary Jews and the priestly and ruling classes. The scribes saw themselves as friends to the rich and powerful, but at the same time they did not hesitate to scold the latter for unjust treatment of the working classes and the poor (Richard A. Horsley, "Social Relations and Social Conflict in the *Epistle of Enoch*," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* [ed. R.A. Argall; Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2000], 100–115

Some support for the plausibility of the scenario sketched above may be found in the relationship between the Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17) and a fragment of a commentary on that work discovered at Qumran: 4Q*Pesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q*247*).[56] The designation of the work as a "*pesher*" is a bit of a misnomer, since Qumran *peshers* typically interpret ancient scriptures as prophecies of current events.[57] As far as can be determined, 4Q*247* did not do that but simply decoded the *Apoc. of Weeks* by supplying names, dates, and events for the apocalypse's ten world-weeks. The extant fragment deals with the fifth, sixth, and seventh weeks. As reconstructed by Milik and Broshi, line two makes reference to the fifth week as described in the *Apoc. of Weeks* (*1En* 93:7), and line six identifies the temple mentioned there as Solomon's, dating it 480 years after the exodus.[58] The sixth week of the *Apoc. of Weeks* finishes with a description of the exile (*1En* 93:8), and the corresponding fourth line of 4Q*247* apparently ties this to "Zedekiah, king of Judah" in the extant text. Line five contains a reference to the "sons of Levi and the people of the land" and line six a reference to a "king of Kittim." Broshi persuasively relates this material to the seventh week of the *Apoc. of Weeks* (*1En* 93:9–10; 91:11).[59] Significant for our purposes is the fact that any reference to the "Kittim" (כתיים), whether this refers to Greeks or Romans, takes us into the post-biblical period and implicitly appeals to historical knowledge on the part of the reader that has been obtained from other sources. A counterpart to 4Q*247*, performing for the *An. Apoc*. the same service that 4Q*247* performs for the *Apoc. of Weeks*, would neatly decode the allegory for interested readers.

If this analysis is correct, the *An. Apoc*. has replaced verification by implicit appeal to existing scriptural authority with verification by implicit appeal to the uncanny correspondence between known historical events

---

[103–115). In this, Horsley is following the lead of Tcherikover, who similarly argued that the scribes represented the interests of the poorer classes (*Hellenistic Civilization*, 124–125). It may be noted that the Hasidim, with whom many identify the militant reformers of *1En* 90:6–9, were scribes or had a notable scribal contingent (1Macc 7:12–13).

[56] Magen Broshi, "247. 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks," *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI. Cryptic Texts and Miscellania, Part 1* (ed. Stephen J. Pfann et al.; DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 187–191, pl. IX.

[57] Broshi freely admits that he is applying the term *pesher* loosely ("247. 4QPesher," 188).

[58] Broshi, "247. 4QPesher," 187, 188–190; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 256. For a more conservative reconstruction, see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–1998) 2. 494–495. Though skimpier, the Martínez-Tigchelaar version does not materially weaken the thesis being argued here.

[59] Broshi, "247. 4QPesher," 190–191.

and the newly revealed pattern, $12\times7+23\times7+23\times7+12\times7$. As mentioned earlier, the finished product fulfills Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 "years" as it was popularly being interpreted in the author's day, returning the allegory to a biblical basis. The allegorical narrative from the completion of the Second Temple to the present and even into the future is just as trustworthy as it was when it was mirroring Genesis through Kings.

4. *Predicting the End*

One difficulty with the "decoding" of the allegory that I have suggested is that it puts the end of the period of the 70 shepherds, and hence the end of the 490 years, well into the future. God should step onto the stage in 114 BCE, according to the dates. That is almost fifty years away from the time of composition. Does the allegory really suggest that the Maccabean war will take half a century? The suggestion is less ridiculous today than it once was, since the second column of the Qumran *War Scroll* (1QM) predicts an eschatological war lasting forty years. Nevertheless, there is another possibility.

It is an apocalyptic cliché that the days and years will be miraculously shortened as the end of the ages approaches.[60] The *An. Apoc.*'s contemporary, Daniel, often mixes periods of three-and-a-half years together with the more usual periods of seven (Dan 7:25; 8:14; 9:24–27; 12:7). If we hypothesize that each of the 12 "times" of the final period in the *An. Apoc.* register in heaven as seven years but are experienced on earth as only three-and-a-half years, 156 BCE emerges as the end of the age (198–156; 42 years). This is about four years into the real author's future if he is writing not long before Judas's death in 160. He would then see himself as writing on the cusp of the 70th week.

The only hint in the allegory that the periods of the last 12 shepherds have been shortened is the comment that these shepherds have shed far more blood than their predecessors (90:17). This raises the question of the motivations of the shepherds. Are they utterly vicious, intent on destroying as many sheep as possible? Or are they indifferent to the fate of the sheep, allowing the flock to suffer attacks by wild beasts because they simply do not care? Or do they take their shepherding jobs seriously enough, but do not like the numbers God has given them, so that they decide on their

---

[60] Examples of this motif are numerous: 4Q*385* 3; *1 En* 80:2; Mark 13:20 (// Matt 24:22); *L.A.B.* 19:13; *2 Bar* 20:1; 54:1; 83:1, 6; *4 Ezra* 4:26; *Barn.* 4:3.

own how many should die—in every case more than authorized?[61] If either the first or second motivation is correct, it scarcely matters whether there are 70 shepherds or one; the results would be the same. But if the third motivation is correct, each angel is arrogantly playing God and dispensing justice as he sees fit. When each shepherd has reached his personal quota of dead sheep, the flock may expect at least some protective governance. This would explain the historical ebbs and flows of violence against the flock, and it would distribute the outbursts in roughly equal measures over time, assuming the 70 angels are about equally cruel. But if the final twelve shepherds have only half the time to effect the desired carnage, their periods are likely to be much bloodier.

In my view, a scenario which (1) provides a plausible motivation for the actions of the wicked angel shepherds, (2) places the apocalyptic author at the beginning of the 70th week within a 490-year scheme that he has created, and (3) presupposes only such literary motifs and clichés as are well documented for the time period and for the genre, is a scenario with much to recommend it. It also provides a sense of temporal urgency for the work, envisioning the end of the age in four years rather than four decades. Nevertheless, because the extant text does not explicitly say that the final twelve periods have been shortened, the case cannot be pressed beyond the claim of plausibility.

5. *The Evidence of the* Book of Jubilees

It may be possible to test some of the hypotheses advanced in this chapter against the evidence provided by the book of *Jubilees*, which apparently refers to the *An. Apoc.* in the midst of a description of the patriarch Enoch and the literature he left behind:

> While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgment. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for all their history.[62] (*Jub.* 4:19)

The first sentence, if not the whole verse, has been widely recognized as a summary of the *An. Apoc.*[63] *Jubilees* was probably written about 160–150

[61] Is this number twice what God has prescribed, based on Isa 40:2?

[62] Trans. VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511), 26.

[63] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, lxxi; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 45; P. Grelot, "Hénoch et ses écritures," *RB* 92 (1975), 481–500 (485); Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 74; Michael Knibb, "Which Parts of 1 Enoch

BCE.[64] As we have seen, the *An. Apoc.* was written shortly before this, between 164 and 160. Since the allusion to the *An. Apoc.* in *Jubilees* occurs in the middle of a description of Enoch's life and works (4:17–24), replete with allusions to the "Astronomy Book" (vv. 17–18) and to the "Book of the Watchers" (vv. 21–23), it would appear that the *An. Apoc.* found a measure of acceptance as authentic Enochic scripture very quickly. This is especially remarkable in light of the fact that the views of the *An. Apoc.* sometimes clash with those of *Jubilees*. According to *Jubilees*, God has appointed spirits to rule over Gentile nations, so as to lead them astray, but over Israel he has appointed no angel or spirit of any kind, and he himself serves diligently as Israel's sole ruler (*Jub* 15:31–32). The *An. Apoc.* contradicts this idea, maintaining that God has withdrawn, and that in his stead he has appointed wicked shepherding angels to rule over Israel since before the Exile (89:59–90:19). This may not be the only point of tension between *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, but it would seem to be an insurmountable one,[65] and when one considers the *An.*

Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16–25," in *Reading From Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines* (ed. J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson; JSOTSup 373; New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003), 254–262 (258–259). At one time the major dissenter was James VanderKam, who argued in 1978 and in 1995 that *Jub.* 4:19 more probably refers to materials in the "Epistle of Enoch" (*1 En* 91–105), especially the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (in chaps. 91–93). VanderKam pointed out that (1) *Jub.* 4:19 mentions only a single dream vision, while the "Dream Visions" booklet as we have it has two; (2) the *An. Apoc.* goes beyond—not "until"—the day of judgment; and (3) the "Epistle" materials resemble a "testimony" more precisely than does the *An. Apoc.* (*Jub.* 4:19b; cf. *1 En* 92:1; 93:2). See James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers* (ed. P.J. Achtemeier; SBLSP 13; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), 1. 229–251 (234–235); and ibid., *Enoch, A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995), 114–115. These arguments have been answered by Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 74 n. 10 (The *Apocalypse of Weeks* also goes beyond the judgment) and by Knibb, "Which Parts of 1 Enoch," 258–259. ("Testimony" is a loose term, and the reference to Enoch's "vision of his sleep" fits the "Dream Visions" better than the "Epistle"). In a more recent publication, VanderKam appears to have acquiesced to the majority view: "He [the author of *Jubilees*] summarizes or alludes to several compositions by Enoch. His words do seem to indicate in several places (e.g. 4.19) that he knows the Enochian 'Book of Dreams' (*1 En* 83–90)—an apocalyptic work written a short time after 164 BCE" (James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001], 21). Tiller was convinced by VanderKam's original arguments, and so he remains the only major voice denying that *Jub.* 4:19 is referring to the *An. Apoc.* (*A Commentary*, 231–232).

64 VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees* (Guides), 17–21.

65 For example, unlike *Jubilees*, the Enochic literature puts no emphasis on the Mosaic law, but *Jubilees* can still endorse Enoch's writings because the omission is more than made up for in the process of spinning out the *Jubilees* narrative. The *An. Apoc.*'s overt presentation of Israel's wicked shepherd-angels in the post-exilic era, on the other hand, would seem much harder to digest. Apparently, the strategy of *Jubilees* in this case is to ignore the post-exilic

Apoc.'s recent vintage, it would not have been surprising to see *Jubilees* pass by this work in silence. Instead, *Jubilees* summarizes and implicitly endorses the *An. Apoc*.

The simplest explanation for *Jubilees*' unqualified embrace of the *An. Apoc*. is that the new work was probably first published within scrolls of Enochic literature, alongside older works of unquestionable Enochic authority.[66] It is possible that the author of *Jubilees* never knew a body of Enochic literature of any kind without the *An. Apoc*. and therefore had little choice but to take the bad with the good. If this hypothesis is correct, then the publication of the *An. Apoc*. rolled in with older Enochic booklets suggests a self-conscious effort by the author or group behind the *An. Apoc*. to present the work from the very beginning as authentic Enochic scripture on a par with other Enochic scripture. This would be an effective strategy for readers with a high regard for the Enochic literature to begin with. In the case of *Jubilees*, this stratagem or something like it appears to have worked.

6. *Conclusions*

In some ways, much of this chapter is bound to seem like an extended excursus from the main thesis of the study; that is, the proposal that the *An. Apoc*. means to set forth the "blessing of all nations" through the offspring of Abraham as eschatological salvation and the re-unification of humanity. But I believe it is necessary to show how many elements of the apocalypse are *not* motivated specifically by that theme and therefore should *not* be artificially forced to be part of that conversation.

In their own different ways, scholars like Goldstein, Nickelsburg, and Assefa have already recognized that there are different purposes at work between the main body of the allegory and the Maccabean episode, even if the explanation they offer (different authors from different times) is unnecessary and unsupported by any good evidence. If the analysis in this chapter is sound, it may be most helpful to regard the *An. Apoc*. as the

---

angelology of the *An. Apoc*. entirely and simply assert something else that harmonizes with a different but equally well-established tradition. Thus, *Jub* 15:31–32 agrees with Deut 32:8 and Sir 17:7 against the *An. Apoc*., which develops the ideas of Jer 23:1–4, Ezekiel 34, and Zechariah 11.

[66] The earliest firm evidence for the inclusion of the *An. Apoc*. with other Enochiana is 4Q*204*, dating from the last third of the first century BCE. This scroll contained at least the "Book of the Watchers," the *An. Apoc*., the "Epistle of Enoch," and the "Book of the Giants." See Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 178–179; and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 10.

product of a writer having *both* a broad theological and a narrowly political purpose. The *An. Apoc*. provides an original interpretation of the past and a prediction of the future, but it presents its message with great sensitivity to the immediate needs of the present, and this needs to be recognized while commenting on the *An. Apoc*.

PART TWO

THE ANIMAL APOCALYPSE (*1 EN* 85:2–90:42)
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

CHAPTER FOUR

THE TEXT OF THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE*

My previous translation of the *An. Apoc.*[1] has been completely revised for the present work, for two reasons. First, further text-critical study has persuaded me to translate some passages differently. Second, the "dynamic equivalence" approach of the earlier translation is appropriate for a wide audience, but a more strictly literal approach is better suited to a detailed scholarly study.

The *An. Apoc.* was composed in Aramaic, translated into Greek, and subsequently translated into Ethiopic, the only language in which it survives entire.[2] The essentially new translation presented here is based on Tiller's critical edition, which supercedes all previous editions in accuracy and comprehensiveness.[3] Since it is not the purpose of the present study to duplicate Tiller's work, the reader may assume throughout my commentary that text-critical silence means that I have little or no dispute with Tiller's treatment. One major difference from Tiller is that I do not provide parallel translations of the Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic manuscript evidence in separate columns. Instead, I have conflated the evidence into a single translation, an attempt to approximate the original *An. Apoc.* as closely as possible in English. This approach is feasible because, with the exceptions of 89:1–6, 31–36 (Aramaic), and 89:42–49 (Greek), the older textual evidence is extremely fragmentary, rarely providing more than individual words or short phrases.[4] The many (and often lengthy) lacunae must be filled out with reconstructions based on the Ethiopic version in order to provide

---

[1] Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 188–211.

[2] It cannot be ruled out that the Ethiopic translators of *1Enoch* made direct use of the Aramaic, but this is no more than a possibility. See James C. VanderKam, "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch," in *"Working With No Data": Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin* (ed. D.M. Golomb; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 247–262.

[3] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 147–219. The one major defect is the omission of EMML 2436, discussed below.

[4] In this sense, the coverage suggested by the "Contents" columns in the Aramaic and Greek tables is somewhat misleading.

anything like continuous text. Hence, in most cases, the translated Aramaic and Greek columns in Tiller's edition can be described with some justification as *revisions of the Ethiopic version* in light of what can be recovered of the earlier versions, rather than as truly independent versions. This being so, by simply translating the Ethiopic, appropriately modified by the Greek and Aramaic evidence wherever it is available, a similar result is achieved. There is a loss in that the differences between the versions are no longer visible, but Tiller has already provided that service admirably, and interested readers are directed there.

In my translation I have given greatest weight to the Aramaic, second place to the Greek, and third to the Ethiopic. Since the textual basis of the *An. Apoc*. has previously been treated by Tiller and others,[5] the evidence can be presented here in summary form.

1. *Aramaic* (*Dead Sea Scrolls*)

Manuscript	*Contents*	*Date*
4Q*204* 4 (= 4QEn^{c} 4)	89:31–37	35–1 BCE
4Q*205* 2 (= 4QEn^{d} 2)	89:11–14, 29–31, 43–44	35–1 BCE
4Q*206* 4 (= 4QEn^{e} 4)	88:3–89:6, 7–16, 26–30	100–50 BCE
4Q*207* 1 (= 4QEn^{f} 1)	86:1–3	150–125 BCE

2. *Greek*

Manuscript	*Contents*	*Date, Description*
Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1809	89:42–49	11th c. tachygraph
Oxyrynchus Papyrus 2069	85:10–86:2; 87:1–3	4th c. fragments

3. *Ethiopic*

Manuscript families	*Most important MSS*
Eth 1: *g, m, q, t, u*, Tana, 1768, 2080, 6281, 7584, 2436	Tana, 2080, 7584, *g, q*, 1768
Eth 2: all others (cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 17)	6974, *n*, Ull, Cambridge 1570

[5] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 127–219; Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 470–491; *Knibb, Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 1–28; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 16–18.

For fuller tables of the Ethiopic manuscripts, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 17;[6] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 142–143; and Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 22–27. I am using the sigla of George Nickelsburg, except that I prefer the more common "Tana" to his "T[9]."

Some further comments on the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* will be helpful at this point, since I offer some original contributions in that area. It is difficult to count the Ethiopic manuscripts. As modern printing presses were not widely used in Ethiopia until well into the 20th century, one must arbitrarily pick a date beyond which it seems unlikely that any manuscript brought forward will contain evidence with convincing text-critical value. For his commentary, Nickelsburg makes use of 49 manuscripts, all dated before 1900.[7] Uhlig uses 42 in his edition.[8] Tiller uses 33.[9] Olson uses 40.[10] The most important principal for bringing order to this riot of data is recognizing that there are two families of manuscripts, "Eth 1" and "Eth 2." The sigla "α" and "β" are also widely used.

The consensus of *1 Enoch* text critics is that Eth 1 manuscripts represent older and more valuable forms of the text, while the Eth 2 group represents the cumulative efforts of several generations of scribes within the Ethiopian church to "clean up" the corruptions and grammatical irregularities in the extant manuscript tradition, with an eye toward producing an official, "Vulgate" version for church use.[11] Though far more numerous, the Eth 2 manuscripts also tend to be more uniform. In contrast, Eth 1 is a more diverse lot. Ten copies have been recognized, although there is an eleventh, to be discussed below. The oldest of these (Tana, 2080, 7584, *g, q*, 1768) wield the greatest text-critical clout among Eth MSS.[12] I should also note that there is ongoing work in this area, and my understanding is that further Eth 1 manuscripts will be published in the near future.

---

[6] Nickelsburg mistakenly dates EMML 7584 to the 18th century, and he does not include it among Eth 1 MSS. It is in fact a solid member of the Eth 1 group and dates to the 15th century. See Tiller, *A Commentary*, 143.

[7] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 16–17.

[8] Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 473–476.

[9] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 142–143.

[10] Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 22–23.

[11] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, xxiv–xxv; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 21–37; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 16; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 129–131.

[12] MS *u* (Abbadianus 55; Knibb: "Abb 55") is one of the oldest MSS and is generally superb until chap. 83, but after that it is greatly abbreviated through capricious omissions. Since this breakdown takes place before the *An. Apoc.*, MS *u* is of limited value to the present study. However, for those first 83 chapters, 7584 (Tiller: "by") is close to *u*, and it frequently agrees with *u* against all other witnesses. Unlike *u*, however, 7584 continues past chap. 83 in good form. It deserves close attention.

Text critics of *1 Enoch* recognize a small group of Eth 2 manuscripts that have (1) a high number of unique readings and (2) agree with the Eth 1 manuscripts more often than others in the Eth 2 group. Charles singles out in this regard the 18th c. MS *n* (= British Museum Orient. 492; Knibb: "BM 492").[13] Knibb agrees with Charles and would place alongside *n* the 18th c. MS Ull (= Ullendorff; Tiller: "ab"), a manuscript unknown to Charles.[14] Uhlig calls attention to Cambridge University Library Add. 1570 (Uhlig, Nickelsburg: "Ca"). He characterizes this 16th c. manuscript as a "Mischtext."[15] To these three manuscripts I would add EMML 6974 (Tiller: "bw"). In preparing my earlier *1 Enoch* translation, I found that 6974 agreed with Eth 1 against all other Eth 2 witnesses even more often than *n*, Ull, or Cambridge 1570.[16]

I must call attention to EMML 2436, a manuscript that has been entirely ignored by other scholars.[17] Because it has a sizable number of Eth 2 readings, I did not originally recognize this 17th c. copy as an Eth 1 specimen, but upon closer examination it became plain that 2436 is as much a member of the Eth 1 group as any of the other ten. Because this eleventh Eth 1 manuscript has been neglected, I frequently note its readings in the *Translation Notes* following each section of the translation. It will be noted that 2436 makes valuable text-critical contributions at 89:10 and 89:63.

For ease of comparison, I have used the same Ethiopic manuscript that Tiller uses as my default text, EMML 2080.[18] In cases where I part from Tiller, I usually note the differences in the *Translation Notes*. I also make frequent

---

[13] R.H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch Edited from Twenty-Three MSS. Together with the Fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906, xxiv; idem, *Book of Enoch*, xxvii.

[14] Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 31.

[15] Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 490. Tiller does not collate Cambridge 1570 in his edition of the *An. Apoc.*, but the loss is not great. According to Uhlig, "Ca" omits **ወገደፉ ፡ ደቂቆሙ ፡** with MS *g* in 89:15 (but *contra* Uhlig [ibid, 685], the phrase is in EMML 2080 [his "Co2"]). Ca also has **ለአሐዱ ፡** with *g* and Ull in 90:9 and supports Eth 1 readings in 89:57 (**አናብስት ፡**), 89:75 (**አባግዐ ፡ ገዳም ፡**), and 90:10 (**ወጸርጉ ፡**).

[16] Only one instance is in the *An. Apoc.* In 90:17, 6974 and 2436 read **እምኔሆሙ ፡** where all other MSS read **እምቅድሜሆሙ ፡** (*apud* Charles, *u* omits the word; *apud* Flemming and Knibb, it does not).

[17] Even though they both make use of the unpublished EMML manuscripts, neither Tiller nor Nickelsburg include 2436. I made use of it in my *Enoch, A New Translation* edition. However, I wrongly classified it as an Eth 2 MS.

[18] Not infrequently, 2080 is the only manuscript that agrees with Tana, which is widely recognized as the oldest and most valuable manuscript discovered to date. Tana itself, however, is erratic and idiosyncratic, making it difficult to use as a base text. Ephraim Isaac uses Tana as his base text ("1 Enoch," *OTP* 1. 5–89), but he is not always consistent in signaling to the reader when he departs from it.

reference to Nickelsburg's Hermeneia edition (*1Enoch 1*), since I anticipate that his translation and commentary will be standard for years to come.

CHAPTER FIVE

IDENTIFICATIONS OF THE WILD ANIMALS IN THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE*

There are two issues to be dealt with in this chapter. The first is mainly a matter of translation, identifying the species of wild animals mentioned in *1En* 89:10–11. The second is mainly a matter of interpretation, identifying the allegorical referents signified by these animals. In the majority of cases there is little controversy about either. But for a significant remainder, these are involved issues that are best settled in advance of a new translation and commentary. It may as well be admitted that another reason for gathering these discussions together into a single chapter is to give readers without knowledge of Ethiopic or interest in the details of philology the option of skipping what will surely be a tedious exercise for some of them. But I make no apologies: Some of these questions have not been reexamined since first discussed by Dillmann in the 1850's.

1. *The Animals in* 1 En *89:10–11: Species*

In these verses we learn that the sons of Noah, represented as bulls, sire all kinds of wild animals after the Flood. These are the Gentiles. When Abraham appears, he is still a white bull like all of his ancestors, and he sires a wild donkey (Ishmael) and a white bull-calf (Isaac). After this donkey, no new species of wild animals are introduced for the remainder of the allegory, and all but four of the animals mentioned in these two verses appear again later as enemies of the flock of sheep (Israel). For some of these later appearances, Greek and Aramaic versions are available, but for the master list of fourteen animals in 89:10 we must rely on the Ethiopic text.

> **89** 10. They began to engender the beasts of the fields, and the birds, and from them it came about that there was every kind of species: lions, leopards, wolves, dogs, hyenas, wild boars, foxes, hyraxes, swine, swifts, eagles, falcons, kites, {phoenixes,} and ravens. And among these there was born a white bull. 11. And they began to bite each other and to seize each other. And the white bull which had been born among them sired a wild donkey—and a white bull-calf as well—and the wild donkeys multiplied.

In the table below, the "Aramaic or Greek" column cites the versional evidence available from elsewhere in the *An. Apoc*. Tiller's and Nickelsburg's translations provide typical representation of other contemporary English renderings, useful for comparison with the present one. It will be noted that Tiller translates each language independently.

Ethiopic	*Aramaic Greek*	*Tiller* (Eth | Aram–Gk)	*Nickelsburg*	*Present translation*
አናብስት ፡ (*ʾanābest*)		lions	lions	**lions**
አናምርት ፡ (*ʾanāmert*)		tigers	leopards	**leopards**
አዝእብት ፡ (*ʾazʾebt*)	דביא	hyenas | bears	wolves	**wolves**
አክልብት ፡ (*ʾaklebt*)	κύνες	dogs	dogs	**dogs**
አጽባዕት ፡ (*ʾaṣbāʿt*)		hyenas	hyenas	**hyenas**
ሐራዊያ ፡ ገዳም ፡ (*ḥarāwiyā gadām*)	חזיריא ὗες	wild boars | boars	wild boars	**wild boars**
ቈናጽል ፡ (*qʷanāṣel*)	ἀλώπεκες	foxes	foxes	**foxes**
ገሐያት ፡ (*gaḥayāt*)		hyraxes	conies	**hyraxes**
ሐንዘር ፡ (*ḥanzar*)		swine	pigs	**swine**
ሲሲት ፡ (*sisit*)		falcons	falcons	**swifts**
አንስርት ፡ (*ʾansert*) (Eth 1 MSS)		eagles	eagles	**eagles**
አውስት ፡ (*ʾawest*) (Eth 2 MSS)		vultures	vultures	**falcons**
ሆባይ ፡ (*hobay*)		kites	kites	**kites**
ፎንቃሰ ፡ (*fonqāsa*)		foqans-birds	eagles	**phoenixes**
ቋዓት ፡ (*qʷāʿāt*)		ravens	ravens	**ravens**
አእዱገ ፡ ገዳም ፡ (*ʾaʾduga gadām*)	ערדיא	wild asses	wild asses	**wild donkeys**

1. **አናብስት ፡** (*ʾanābest*) "lions." There are no ambiguities here.

2. **አናምርት ፡** (*ʾanāmert*) "leopards." This has usually been translated "tigers," but there are no tigers in Palestine, and Ethiopic **ነምር ፡** (*namr*) is cognate to Heb/Aram נמר (leopard), which is almost certainly the intended animal.[1]

[1] See Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 634; Wolf Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (*Classical Ethiopic*) (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), 398; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 385 n. 80.

3. **አዝእብት ፡** (*ʾazʾebt*) "wolves." Thanks to the Qumran finds, we now know that behind this Ethiopic word stands דביא (4Q*206* 4 ii 17; iii 14 [= *1En* 89:14, 27]). The Aramaic could be either "wolves" or "bears," depending on vocalization. Patrick Tiller and Klaus Beyer prefer "bears,"[2] but Nickelsburg argues persuasively for "wolves."[3] Even though **ዝእብ ፡** (*zeʾb*) normally means "hyena" (and so Tiller), it is also immediately recognizable as a cognate for "wolf" in numerous semitic languages. Furthermore, another Ethiopic noun meaning "hyenas" appears two words down, and it is unlikely that **አዝእብት ፡** would represent the same animal. "Wolves" best explains all the evidence.

4. **አክልብት ፡** (*ʾaklebt*) "dogs." κύνες in Vat 1809 (= *1En* 89:42–43, 46–47, 49).

5. **አጽባዕት ፡** (*ʾaṣbāʿt*) "hyenas." No ambiguities.

6. **ሐራዊያ ፡ ገዳም ፡** (*ḥarāwiyā gadām*) "wild boars." חזיריא in 4Q*205* 2 iii 28 (= *1En* 89:43); ר[חזי] in 4Q*205* 2 i 26 (= *1En* 89:12); ὗες in Vat 1809 (*1En* 89:42–43, 49). It is odd that the list in 89:10 contains two words for pigs. This first one is a common Ethiopic term and is used again in 89:42–43, 49, 66, 72. Standing alone, **ሐራዉ·ያ ፡** (*ḥarāweyā*) simply means "pig, boar," but with the addition of **ገዳም ፡** ("of the field") or **ሐቅል ፡** ("of the wilderness"), it means "wild boar."[4] The second word, **ሐንዘር ፡** (*ḥanzar*), ninth on the list, is a *hapax legomenon*, even within the *An. Apoc.* In context, **ሐንዘር ፡** presumably stands for a domestic porcine, and as Dillmann long ago recognized,[5] it transliterates חזיר, a general term for pig. Although this Aramaic word does indeed appear in the *An. Apoc.* (4Q*205* 2 i 26; iii 28), surprisingly, it lies behind **ሐራዊያ ፡ ገዳም ፡**. For his part, Tiller thinks **ሐንዘር ፡** is secondary and should be deleted, largely because he cannot find two Aramaic words that designate respectively domestic and wild pigs.[6] But this approach ignores the fact that the *An. Apoc.* translators did not restrict themselves to one-to-one equivalency in word count.[7] Also, the fact that **ሐንዘር ፡** is an apparently unique transliteration of an animal name that appears in the original Aramaic *An.*

---

[2] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 269 n. 1; 272, 276–277; Beyer, *Die Aramäischen Texte*, 245.

[3] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 378.

[4] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 88.

[5] Dillman, *Das Buch Henoch*, 259.

[6] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 30.

[7] An entire phrase may be employed to render a single word, or vice versa.; i.e., **ሐራዊያ ፡ ገዳም ፡** = ὗες; **ባግእ ፡** = דכר די עז (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 275).

Apoc. is a good reason not to discard it hastily.[8] As Bryan points out, domestic and wild pigs *are* distinguishable in Hebrew thought (*m. Ḥul. 9.2*),[9] so there is no *a priori* reason why both animals may not be original. Perhaps **ሐንዘር ፡** is a truncated form of חזיר של ישוב ("domestic pigs"), as Bryan suggests.[10]

7. **ቈናጽል ፡** (*q*^{w}*anāṣel*) "foxes." ἀλώπεκες in Vat 1809 (= *1En* 89:42–43, 49).

8. **ገሐያት ፡** (*gaḥayāt*) "hyraxes." Based on the three other known occurrences of **ግሔ ፡** , (*1En* 96:2; Ps 104:18 [103:19]; Prov 30:26), this animal can be identified with reasonable certainty as *procavia capensis* (Heb/Aram שפן; LXX χοιρογρύλλιος). The hyrax (also called "coney," "rock badger," and "rock hyrax") is a grass-eating mammal that lives in rocky places and resembles a large rabbit, except for its inconspicuous ears. It is listed as unclean in Lev 11:5 and Deut 14:7.

9. **ሐንዘር ፡** (*ḥanzar*) "swine," "domestic pigs." See no. 6 above.

10. **ሲሲት ፡** (*sisit*) "swifts." This is another *hapax legomenon*. By his own admission, Dillmann can make nothing of the word itself, and his "falcons" is nothing more than a guess based on its position at the beginning of the list of predatory birds.[11] Black has suggested "ostrich," based on the similarity between **ሲሲት ፡** (*sisit*) and Aram **ציצא**, the translation of תחמס found in *Tg. Onq*. Lev 11:16 // Deut 14:15.[12] This suggestion has been accepted and further elaborated by Bryan.[13] An even closer match, however, may be סוסיא (*Tg. Onq*. Isa 38:14). Hebrew סיס (Isa 38:14; Jer 8:7) means "swift" or "swallow" (LXX: χελιδών). Theodotian renders σῖς in Isa 38:14; Aquila renders σείς in Jer 8:7. Recalling the opening phrase of *1En* 89:10 ("They began to engender the *beasts of the fields*, and the *birds*"), it may not be accidental that the author

---

[8] Bryan claims this as "evidence that the Ethiopic scholars had direct access to an Aramaic version of the text" (*Cosmos*, 115).

[9] Bryan, *Cosmos*, 116.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 259 ("die Uebersetzung mit *Falken* macht keinen Anspruch auf Richtigkeit"). Even Dillmann's conjecture presupposes that **ሲሲት ፡** is the first bird rather than the last mammal in the roll call of 89:10, as he himself recognizes in his *Lexicon* (p. 394: "nomen aut *ferae* aut *avis rapacis*"). Despite the fact that "falcons" is nothing more than a shot in the dark, Leslau accepts it without qualification (*Comparative Dictionary*, 516), and all translators of *1Enoch* except Black and Bryan have continued to use "falcons."

[12] Black, *Book of Enoch*, 264. תחמס is itself uncertain; it could just as easily be an owl (cf. *HALOT*, 1717).

[13] Bryan, *Cosmos*, 121–122.

has included both a small, harmless, beast of the field (the hyrax) and a small, harmless, bird of the air (the swift) for readers to ponder over in the context of the allegory.

11. **አንስርት ፡** (*ʾansert*) (Eth 1) and **አው·ስት ፡** (*ʾawest*) (Eth 2) "eagles" and "falcons." The manuscript families neatly divide over the identity of the eleventh creature. The only exceptions are 2080 and 2436, both of which have both birds, but in 2080 the passage is a correction, and this probably indicates the secondary addition of **አው·ስት ፡** , since alterations to this manuscript usually conform it to the majority text represented by the Eth 2 group.[14] Manuscript 2436 includes both birds in the autograph, but it omits the next bird, "kites." I suspect that "phoenixes" (see below) is a secondary addition, and that another bird was always sacrificed to make room for it in order to maintain the list at exactly fourteen animals, a counterpart, perhaps, to the list of fourteen species of evergreen trees in *1En* 3:1.[15] Eth 1 MSS sacrificed the falcons; Eth 2 the eagles, and 2436, uniquely, the kites. The corrector to 2080, at an unknown date, added in falcons but neglected to delete anything. As they both appear later in the allegory, I take both eagles and falcons to be original.

Concerning **አንስርት ፡** (*ʾansert*) "eagles," there are no translation difficulties beyond the ambiguity attending this common semitic root across all of the languages in which it appears: *nsr* can mean either "eagle" or "vulture." For **አው·ስት ፡** (*ʾawest*) the situation is far less clear. Without exception, all translators follow Dillmann in rendering "vultures" ("vautours," "Geiern"), which is based on the fact that in its one appearance in the Eth OT, **አው·ስት ፡** = גּוּשׁ (Job 39:27). Nevertheless, this identification is not strong, and Leslau's lexicon lists only "bird of prey" for **አው·ስት ፡** .[16] Dillmann himself does not seem very confident about "vulture," and he derives **አው·ስት ፡** from Heb **ט֫יָע** ("bird of prey").[17] The four raptors that appear here in 89:10 as well as

---

[14] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 32 n. 32. For the two families of Eth MSS, see above, pp. 117–118.

[15] The Ethiopian church developed its own typological interpretations of the 14 trees (see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 148) and therefore had its own reasons for a conservative attachment to the number 14 in these texts. This would explain the preservation of a total of 14 in the list at 89:10 in all the variants of the MSS.

[16] Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 49. Ethiopic has several words for "vulture" (**ሊሎ ፡** , **ግሪጻ ፡** , **ጊጻ ፡** , **ንስር ፡**).

[17] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 259; idem, *Ethiopic Grammar, Second Edition Enlarged and Improved* (trans J.A. Chrichton; London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), 306. In his *Lexicon* (p. 790), Dillmann defines **አው·ስት ፡** as "nomen avis rapacis, ut videtur *vultur*, גּוּשׁ Job 39, 27."

several times in the latter part of the *An. Apoc.* (90:2, 11, 13, 16) probably come from the first six predatory birds listed in Lev 11:13–15 // Deut 14:12–14, except that **አወ·ስት ፡** stands in the place of the second, third, and fourth birds on the Mosaic list. (The reason for abbreviating the catalog in this way rather than simply taking the first four birds presented by Moses will be discussed below, under "ravens.") The same abbreviation from six to four occurs in *Barn* 10:4, probably under the influence of the *An. Apoc.*, and this provides us with the Greek behind the Ethiopic for the four: ἀετός, ὀξύπτερος, ἴκτινος, κόραξ.[18] The second term, "sharp-wing" (= falcon)[19] could also be construed as a generic term for any bird of prey (i.e., "swift-wing"), and this may explain why the Ethiopic translator used an equally vague word, **አወ·ስት ፡** . In any event, the most credible candidate for the original raptor in the *An. Apoc.* would be the Aramaic equivalent of one of the three Mosaic birds in the space taken by ὀξύπτερος/**አወ·ስት ፡** . They are פרס, עזניה, and דאה. Of these, the best candidate is דאה (usually spelled דיתא in Aramaic). There are three reasons to think so. First, as already mentioned, in the Eth OT at Job 39:27, **አወ·ስት ፡** = γύψ, and in LXX Lev 11:14 // Deut 14:13, γύψ = דאה. Second, Dillmann lists only seven known appearances of **አወ·ስት ፡** in ancient Ethiopic literature, and in all seven cases it is paired with the eagle.[20] This is strikingly similar to דאה, which also enjoys a "salt and pepper" association with the eagle in Ugaritic (√ *d'y*) and in biblical Hebrew.[21] Third, as I have argued, the Greek word translating the second Enochic raptor (ὀξύπτερος) probably designates the falcon, and if the translator had דיתא before him, there are a few faint indicators suggesting that the translator knew what he was doing. In Ugaritic the *d'iy* bird is associated with falconry. In the *Legend of Aqhat*, the goddess Anat enlists the hunter Yatp in her plan to attack Aqhat: "She put him like a *nšr* on her wristlet, like a *d'iy* on her glove" (*CTA* 1.18 iv

---

[18] For the relationship between *Barnabas* and the *An. Apoc.*, see the Appendix (pp. 245–252 esp. 250–251).

[19] In Homer and Hesiod, ὀξύπτερος designates the falcon. "Sharp-wing" probably refers to the falcon's distinctive wing shape. See the Appendix (p. 250 n. 17).

[20] Five of the seven are in the *An. Apoc.* (89:10; 90:2, 11, 13, 16). The others are *1 En* 96:2 and Job 39:27. The latter two examples weaken Tiller's argument that the invariable joining of **አወ·ስት ፡** to **አንስርት ፡** (eagles), with no independent function, is evidence that **አወ·ስት ፡** is an addition to the original text of the *An. Apoc.* (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 32). For the occurrences of **አወ·ስት ፡** , cf. Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 790.

[21] In the Ugaritic *Legend of Aqhat*, the *nšr* and *d'y* birds are frequently in poetic parallel (*CTA* 1.18 iv 17–18, 19–21, 21–23, 27–29, 30–31). As a noun, דאה appears only on the lists in Lev 11:14 // Deut 14:13 (and possibly in Isa 34:15 under a different spelling), but דאה produced a denominative verb with the meaning "to swoop," "to soar," and as such it is commonly paired with נשר (Deut 28:49; Jer 48:40; 49:22).

28–29: *štn.knšr.bḫbšh.km.d'iy.bt'rtp*).[22] This is *not* to suggest that the Greek translator was familiar with Ugaritic literature, only that דיתא may have retained old associations with a specific hunting fowl that have been lost to modern lexicologists, who find only a vague bird of prey in this root.[23] It may also be relevant that the falcon is the fastest-flying raptor by a wide margin, and so it would be a superior candidate to lend its name to a Hebrew verb meaning, "to fly swiftly, dart through the air."[24] The evidence is far from conclusive, but such clues as are available suggest the falcon more than any other species as the second predatory bird on the Enochic list: דיתא = ὀξύπτερος = **አወ·ስት ፡** .

12. **ሆባይ ፡** (*hobay*) "kites." Like ἴκτινον, which it regularly translates in the LXX, **ሆባይ ፡** can also mean "hawks" in general, but what is needed is a specific species.

13. **ፎንቃሰ ፡** (*fonqāsa*), also **ፎቃንሰ ፡** (with other variants) "phoenixes." Dillmann identified this as a transliteration of the fabled Greek bird. An Ethiopic-Amharic dictionary in his possession equated the phoenix with the eagle, and since the end result is the quartet of raptors that appear frequently in chapter 90, most scholars have been happy to follow Dillmann in rendering **ፎንቃሰ ፡** as "eagles."[25] I presume that the Ethiopian authors

---

[22] For this translation, see J.C.L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977), 112. Gibson renders "eagle" and "hawk" for *nšr* and *d'iy*, but he explains in a footnote (n. 5) that the imagery comes from falconry. It should be noted that this inference has not gone unchallenged. See the comments of Dennis Pardee (*COS* 1.103.349 n. 72). He and other translators have rendered differently: "[she] puts him like a bird in her belt, Like a hawk into her sheath" (Mark Smith in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* [ed. S.B. Parker; SBLWAW 9; USA: Scholars Press, 1977], 66); "she put him in her pouch like a vulture, in her bag like a bird" (Michael D. Coogan, *Stories from Ancient Canaan* [Louisville: Westminster, 1978], 40); "She … [m]akes him like a vulture in her girdle, Like a swift flier in her pouch" (*ANET*, 153). But Gibson's approach has been defended by Edwin Firmage ("Zoology [Animal Names in the Bible]," *ABD* 6: 1146), and it is supported by what appear to be other allusions to falconry in the Ugaritic literature (*CTA* 1.2 iv 13–14: "May you leap from Baal's hand, Like a raptor (*nšr*) from his fingers" [trans. Smith, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, 103]).

[23] דאה / דיתא: "name of an unclean bird" (Marcus Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targamim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature* [New York: Judaica Press, 1903], 275); "hawk?" (Firmage, *ABD* 6:1155); "bird of prey, possibly kite" (*BDB*, 178); "bird of prey, red kite" (*HALOT*, 207). The NRSV translates דאה as "buzzard" in Lev 11:14 // Deut 14:13. Similar uncertainty attends Ugaritic *d'iy*, as the translations in the previous note demonstrate.

[24] So *BDB*, 178 (s.v. דאה). The Peregrine falcon is widely recognized as the fastest creature on earth.

[25] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 259; followed by Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 191), Martin

of the Amharic dictionary had at least as much interest in smoothing out the wrinkles of *1 Enoch* as some modern scholars do, and so I consider their conveniently harmonizing equation between phoenixes and eagles of limited value. It is true that a slender case may be made that the phoenix was regarded as a kind of eagle,[26] but what is needed is an explanation why the presumptive נשר of the original ended up as the exotic phoenix in the Ethiopic version, rather than remaining a simple eagle. I see two plausible explanations for the unexpected presence of the phoenix in the *An. Apoc*. First, phoenixes make some impressive appearances in the apocalypse known as *2 Enoch* (19:6 [all texts]; 12:1–3, 15:1 [long texts]), generally regarded as an Egyptian work of perhaps the first century CE.[27] It may be that the Greek translator of *1 Enoch* moved in the same circles responsible for the production or dissemination of *2 Enoch* and wanted to forge an additional link between the works by importing phoenixes into the *An. Apoc*. aviary. Second, with its singular nature, the phoenix proved useful to Monophysite Christians during the seventh century for demonstrating the one nature in the person of Christ, and so the bird enjoyed a certain prominence and popularity.[28] Either of these circumstances would provide a motive and an occasion for writing the phoenix into *1 Enoch*.

14. ቋዓት፡ (*qʷāʿāt*) "ravens." Across all three languages, the word can also mean "crows," but the larger ravens are fitter companions to the other birds of prey. Of course, they are also black, which probably explains why the author of the *An. Apoc*. went this far down the list of birds in the Mosaic source (i.e., to the sixth place) in order to complete his foursome. The color symbolism of the *An. Apoc*. (white = good, black = bad), made the ravens an attractive symbol for the current regime, the Seleucids, regarded by the author as the worst of the worst among Israel's Hellenistic victimizers

(*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 206), Black (*Book of Enoch*, 75), Olson (*Enoch, A New Translation*, 193), Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 365), etc. This solution also requires that one follow the Eth 2 MSS in 89:10 against the uniform Eth 1 evidence. In fairness to Dillmann, it must be noted that Eth 2 MSS were the only kind known to him.

[26] Herodotus (*Hist*. 2:73) describes the phoenix as resembling the eagle in shape and size. A few scholars have argued that Ps 103:5 alludes to the phoenix ("Your youth is renewed as the eagle's"). See Hermann Gunkel, *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 445; and Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms III, 101–150* (AB 17A; New York: Doubleday, 1970), 27.

[27] For a recent survey and discussion, see Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 320–333.

[28] R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (EPRO 24; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 359. The Ethiopian Church is, of course, non-Chalcedonian (i.e., "monophysite").

(cf. 90:17). Here, there was no need to add the actual epithet "black," as with other animals (bulls in 85:3; 89:9; boars in 89:12), since the ערב comes in only one color.

15. **አእዱገ ፡ ገዳም ፡** (*ʾaduga gadām*) "wild donkeys." עדיא in 4Q*205* 2 i 25, 28 (= *1En* 89:11, 13); 4Q*206* 5 ii 15 (= *1En* 89:13). No ambiguities.

2. *The Animals in* 1En *89:10–11: Ethnic/Political Identity*

Because of their stature among current commentaries on the *An. Apoc.*, I again furnish Tiller's and Nickelsburg's interpretations in the following table, plus those of R.H. Charles, the most influential *1Enoch* commentator of the 20th century.[29] For the sake of easier comparison, I have taken the liberty of homogenizing the terminology (e.g., "Chaldeans" and "Aram" become "Babylonians" and "Syria"). For the animals that are in dispute, it would be easy to extend the chart with further suggestions offered by other scholars, but the table as it stands provides a sufficient survey of the terrain to facilitate discussion, divided here into two areas, the beasts and the birds.

	Charles		*Tiller*	*Nickelsburg*	*Present study*
lions	Assyrians and		Babylonians	Babylonians	**Babylonians**
leopards	Babylonians		Syrians	Syrians	**Assyrians**
wolves	Egyptians		Egyptians	Egyptians	**Egyptians**
dogs	Philistines		Philistines	Philistines	**Philistines**
hyenas	Ethiopians?		Assyrians	Moabites	**Syrians**
wild boars	Edomites	Samaritans	Edomites and Amalekites	Edomites and Amalekites	**Edomites and Amalekites**
foxes	Ammonites		Ammonites and Moabites	Ammonites	**Ammonites and Moabites**
eagles	Macedonians		Macedonians	Ptolemies,	**Macedonians**
falcons	Ptolemies	Ammonites	Edomites?	Macedonians, Seleucids	**Thracians/ Anatolians**
kites		Edomites	Ptolemies		**Ptolemies**
ravens	Seleucids		Seleucids		**Seleucids**
wild asses	Ishmaelites, incl. Midian		Ishmaelites, incl. Midian	Ishmaelites incl. Midian	**Ishmaelites, incl. Midian**

[29] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 191–192, 195, 199, 202, 205; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 32–36, 357; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 358.

a. *"The Beasts of the Field"*

The best discussion is Tiller's, who assigns nations to animals by a methodical process of elimination, starting with the most obvious ones and ending with conjectures about the more obscure ones. He has greatly simplified the process by preparing a table of Israel's biblical enemies from the time of the judges to the Exile, along with a table of Israel's opponents in the *An. Apoc.* for the same period.[30] The wolves, dogs, and wild asses have never been problematic. They are respectively the Egyptians, the Philistines, and the Ishmaelites (including the Midianites).[31] There is also a consensus that the foxes represent the Ammonites, and the wild boars the Edomites, the only question being whether they include more than just these. Tiller makes a plausible case that the foxes include all the children of Lot, including both Ammonites and Moabites,[32] while the boars represent all the children of Esau, including both the Edomites and Amalekites.[33]

Among Israel's major pre-Hellenistic enemies, this leaves Babylon, Assyria, and Syria still waiting for their assignments, and lions, leopards, and hyenas available for the task. The continued lack of consensus in establishing these identifications is the result of conflicting interpretations of the *An. Apoc.* narrative from the time of the late monarchy until the exile (89:54–65). Following the persecution of Elijah and his ascension (v. 52) and the fruitless efforts of subsequent prophets (v. 53), the section in question begins:

> 54. And after that, I saw that they abandoned the house of the Lord of the flock and his tower. They went utterly astray, and their eyes became blinded. And I saw how the Lord of the flock effected a great deal of slaughter against them in their pastures, until the flock invited that slaughter and betrayed his place. 55. And he abandoned them into the hands of the lions, leopards, wolves, and hyenas, and into the hands of the foxes, and to all the beasts. And those wild beasts proceeded to tear the flock to pieces. 56. I saw too that he abandoned their house and their tower, and he gave all of them into the hands of the lions to tear and devour them—into the hands of all the beasts. 57. Then I

---

[30] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 33–35.

[31] Marginalia in several EMML MSS (2080, 2436, 6974) confirm that traditional Ethiopian exegesis had no difficulty in making the same connections that modern scholars do: wolves = Egyptians, **ግብጻዊ ፡** (abbreviated **ግብ** or **ግብጻ**); dogs = Philistines, **ኢሎፍሊ ፡** (abbreviated **ኢሎ**); wild donkeys = Ishmaelites, **ይስማኤላዊ ፡** (abbreviated **ይስ** or **ይስማኤ**). Similarly, the Greek copy of 89:43–49 (Vat 1809) correctly identifies the foxes as Ammonites, the boars as Amalekites, and the dogs as Philistines. See Tiller, *A Commentary*, 23.

[32] Nickelsburg's refusal to include the Moabites with the foxes and his identification of the Moabites with the hyenas is the result, in my view, of an overemphasis on 2 Kgs 24:2 as the key for identifying the intended referents (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 385).

[33] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 32–33.

> began to cry aloud with all my might, and to appeal to the Lord of the flock, representing to him how the flock was being devoured by the wild beasts. 58. But he remained silent while he watched, and he was quite happy that they were devoured, swallowed up, and carried off, and he left them in the hands of all the beasts as food.

At this point there is a substantial intermission in the historical narration as the author describes the heavenly commissioning of 70 shepherds to oversee the flock, complete with God's detailed instructions to an angelic auditor to keep careful records of their doings (vv. 59–64). Earthly history then resumes:

> 65. And I watched until those shepherds pastured, (each) within his appointed time, and they began killing and destroying far more than they had been commanded, and they abandoned the flock into the hands of the lions. 66. And the lions and the leopards devoured and swallowed up the majority of the flock, and the wild boars devoured along with them; and they burned that tower and demolished that house.

Verse 66 ends with a fairly transparent reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in 587, the burning of the temple ("tower") and the destruction of the city ("house"). Taken together with the reference to Elijah in verse 52, we all start out with rough parameters for identifying the intermediate history in verses 54–58. Since the mayhem described therein presumably precedes the Babylonian conquest in verses 65–66, most scholars assign these verses to the Assyrian period, and the violence is often identified with the Assyrian invasions of the eighth century.[34] Black thinks that verses 55–56 describe the Assyrian conquest more than once, and so he suspects a literary doublet, the result of "expansions by translators."[35] Carol Newsom moves the chronology forward and finds a different doublet: "a literary seam appears in the repetition of the destruction of Jerusalem (En. 89.55–58, 65–67)."[36] Nickelsburg is certain that verses 54–58 begin with the reign of Manasseh (the subject of all of verse 54).[37]

The historical referents of some of the animals are tied up in these issues. For most scholars, the lions are the Babylonians in verses 65–66, but in that case, who are the leopards and wild boars who join them (v. 66)? And why

---

[34] E.g., Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 233; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 202; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 216; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 270–272; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 105.

[35] Black, *Book of Enoch*, 270.

[36] Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 21.

[37] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 385. (This is one of his most important interpretive keys for the *An. Apoc.*)

are these lions already a player back in verse 55? Several scholars conclude that the lions must be the Assyrians throughout, and they are therefore willing to assign all of verses 55–66a to the period of Assyrian dominance, only turning over the reins to the Babylonian leopards well into verse 66, just in time for the destruction of Jerusalem.[38] Tiller and Nickelsburg are among those who are convinced that the lions are consistently Babylon,[39] but since these two specialists do not seem to consider the possibility of an Assyrian presence as late as the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 (the leopards of v. 66), they conclude that the leopards must represent Syria—virtually by default. Assyria is then given almost no role to play in the allegory, although Tiller lets them have his still-unused hyenas, which appear only once (v. 55) after the initial list of 89:10.[40] Finally, there is a middle position taken by those critics who have given up trying to make consistent sense of the animal symbolism in these verses and have decided that "lions and leopards" *together* must stand for "Assyrians and Babylonians," with the lions used indiscriminately for either nation.[41]

The difficulties have been exaggerated. In *1En* 89:55–58, 65–66 the allegorist follows the biblical narrative of 2 Kgs 24–25, supplemented by information drawn from the prophets. The reason the flock is said to be given over *into the hands of the lions* three times (vv. 55, 56, 65) is that there were in fact three successful Babylonian campaigns against Judah under Nebuchadnezzar:

1En 89:55	2 Kgs 24:1–2
And he abandoned them into the hands of the lions, leopards, wolves, and hyenas, and into the hands of the foxes, and to all the beasts. And those wild beasts proceeded to tear the flock to pieces.	1. In his [Jehoiakim's] days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up; Jehoiakim became his servant for three years; then he turned and rebelled against him. 2. And Yahweh sent against him bands of Chaldeans, bands of the

[38] Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 233; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 220; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.187; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 272.

[39] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 34; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 385. James C. VanderKam is another specialist who belongs in this camp: VanderKam, "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Exile: Old Testament Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (ed. J.M. Scott; JSJSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89–109 (97).

[40] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 35–36.

[41] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 199, 202; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 105 ("There is a half-hearted attempt to distinguish the Babylonians as tigers [leopards] … but it is not carried through with consistency"). Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 264) and Uhlig (*Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 693) appear to have reached a similar conclusion.

Arameans, bands of the Moabites, and bands of the Ammonites; he sent them against Judah to destroy it, according to the word of Yahweh that he spoke by his servants the prophets.

1 En 89:56

I saw too that he abandoned their house and their tower, and he gave all of them into the hands of the lions to tear and devour them—into the hands of all the beasts.

2 Kgs 24:10–13

10. At that time the servants of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up to Jerusalem, and the city was besieged. 11. Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came to the city, and his servants were besieging it; 12. Jehoiachin king of Judah surrendered to the king of Babylon, himself, his mother, his servants, his officers, and his courtiers. The king of Babylon took him prisoner in the eighth year of his reign. 13. He took away all the treasures of the house of Yahweh, and the treasures of the king's house.

1 En 89:65–66

65. And I watched until those shepherds pastured, (each) within his appointed time, and they began killing and destroying far more than they had been commanded, and they abandoned the flock into the hands of the lions. 66. And the lions and the leopards devoured and swallowed up the majority of the flock, and the wild boars devoured along with them; and they burned that tower and demolished that house.

2 Kgs 25

1. And in the ninth year of his [Zedekiah's] reign, in the tenth month, on the tenth day of the month, King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon came with all his army against Jerusalem, and laid siege to it …

9. He burned the house of Yahweh, the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem; every great house he burned down. 10. All the army of the Chaldeans who were with the captain of the guard broke down the walls around Jerusalem.

The *first* Babylonian incursion takes place in 604. The parties mentioned in the events of 2 Kgs 24:2, three years later, are represented in the *An. Apoc*. by the lions (= Nebuchadnezzar and the "bands of Chaldeans"), the foxes (= the Moabites and Ammonites), and the hyenas, who by a process of elimination would most likely be the "bands of Aramaeans" (i.e., Syrians). By listing also leopards and wolves, the author alludes to the prior humiliations of Judah by the Assyrians in the time of Hezekiah (701 BCE; cf. 2 Kgs 18–19) and by the Egyptians in the time of Josiah (609 BCE; cf. 2 Kgs 23:31–35). The animals

are listed in the hierarchical order of 89:10, not the sequential order of the historical events. There is a potentially puzzling element in this scenario that will be taken up below.

The *second* abandonment into the hands of the Babylonian lions is the conquest of 597, in which Nebuchadnezzar captures and sacks the city. Note that this time, no other nations are mentioned in the biblical account, only Nebuchadnezzar and his "servants," and that the *An. Apoc.* follows suit, mentioning only the lions and unnamed "beasts."

The *third* conquest is the debacle of 587. The *An. Apoc.* includes the leopards (Assyrians) and the wild boars (Edomites) along with the lions (v. 66). Neither of these presents a problem. With regard to the boars, even though the histories of 1–2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah say nothing about Edomite depredations in connection with the Babylonian conquest, this tradition is widely attested elsewhere: Ps 137:7; Lam 4:21–22; Obad 10–16; Ezek 25:12–14; 35; and 1 Esdr 4:45. With regard to the leopards, if we again look outside the usual histories, we will find a prophecy in Ezekiel, just five years before 587, declaring that Assyrians will join with the Babylonians in the imminent conquest of Jerusalem (Ezek 23:23–25). Furthermore, it is almost certain that this prophecy was known to the author of the *An. Apoc.*[42] In verses 11–15 of the same chapter Ezekiel mentions the Assyrians alongside the Babylonians as contemporary "lovers" of the faithless "Oholibah" (= Judah). The author of the *An. Apoc.* would have had biblical warrant for believing that the Assyrians were actively engaged with Judah and involved in the events of the time. This is the best circumstantial evidence that the leopards are not Syria, as Tiller and Nickelsburg suppose, but Assyria, since there are no similar traditions associating Syria with the destruction of 587.

The weakest point in the above analysis is the exceedingly casual reference to the Assyrian invasion of Judah in 701 merely by adding "leopards" to the list in 89:55, and moreover, adding them *after* the lions that signify the Babylonian incursion of 604 and the response to Jehoiakim's rebellion in 601. It is true that the late placement of the Egyptian wolves within that same verse (= Neco's subjugation in 609) is ample proof that the order of the animals reflects the list of 89:10 rather than chronology, but the difference in that case is only a few years. If the leopards in verse 55 are Sennacherib's Assyrians, then the chronological flashback goes back a full century. Understandably, some might find this hard to accept.

---

[42] The lurid metaphor, sexual organs like those of horses (*1En* 86:4; 90:21), comes from Ezek 23:20.

In fact, it is not so strange. The author has the testimony of Isa 47:5–6 that already in the days of Isaiah, God had specifically given over Judah into the hands of the Babylonians, using the strong language of the prophetic perfect: "I gave them into your hand, you showed them no mercy (v. 6)." It follows that even before Assyria invaded the north, deliverance of the south into the power of Babylon, into the hands of the lions, was a *fait accompli* in heaven. The writer of 2 Kings displays a somewhat similar sensibility, presenting the Assyrian foray into Judah as merely a foreshadow of the more genuine Babylonian threat, for the ominous account of Hezekiah's foolish boasting before Babylonian envoys and the prophecy of doom he hears afterwards come almost immediately after the account of the Assyrian crisis (2 Kgs 20:12–19). The author of the *An. Apoc.* is a biblicist and may be forgiven for concluding from such evidence that as far as Judah is concerned, the Assyrian chapter was only a footnote within the over-arching story of Babylon.

The lions, then, are most likely Babylon and nothing else. As for the leopards and hyenas, there are a few further clues that the former are indeed Assyria and the latter are indeed Syria, which may be added to the circumstantial evidence so far presented. The discernable methods used by the author for selecting his animal symbols are (1) incidental biblical animal allusions in association with a nationality, and (2) puns. In the first category are the well-known examples of Gen 16:12 for the Ishmaelite donkeys,[43] 1 Sam 17:43 for the Philistine dogs,[44] and Neh 4:3 for the Ammonite foxes.[45] In the second category are the elephants, camels, and donkeys that represent the monstrous offspring of the Watchers and their human wives (86:4). As Milik has pointed out, these animal names are puns on Nephilim, Gibborim, and Elioud, the three types of giants mentioned in one of the Greek versions of *1En* 7:2, a quotation of the text found in the Byzantine chronographer Syncellus.[46] The names ultimately derive from Gen 6:4:

---

[43] "He [Ishmael] shall be a wild ass of a man."

[44] "The Philistine said to David, 'Am I a dog, that you come to me with sticks?'"

[45] "Tobiah the Ammonite … said … 'If a fox goes up on it, he will break down their stone wall.'"

[46] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 240. Olson (*Enoch, A New Translation*, 34, 263–265) and Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 182, 184–185) accept the Syncellus version of *1En* 7:2 as closest to the original, in which case the "Book of the Watchers" was probably the source for the author of the *An. Apoc.* The names also appear in *Jub* 7:22 (Giants, Naphilim, Elyo). Numerous explanations for *Elioud* have been proposed, but derivation from the "offspring" (√ ילד) of the Watchers and their human wives is the simplest and most convincing. See Tiller (*A Commentary*, 242–243), and Black (*Book of Enoch*, 126).

Genesis 6:4	Syn *1En* 7:2 (= Aram equivalent)	*1En* 86:4 (= Aram equivalent)
נפלים (*nephilim*)	ναφηλείμ (= נפילין)	elephants (= פילין)
גברים (*gibborim*)	γίγαντες (= גברין)	camels (= גמלין)
ילדים (*yeladim*; the offspring implied by the phrase וילדו להם, "and they *bore* to them …")	ἐλιούδ (= ילודין)	donkeys (= ערדין)

In light of the author's method, it may not be coincidental that "hyena" (צבוע) forms a fine pun on Zobah (צובא, also צובה), the dominant Aramaean kingdom of early biblical narrative (2 Sam 10:6, 8; 2 Sam 8:3, 5, 12; 1 Kgs 11:23). In fact, "kings of Zobah" (מלכי צובה) is used virtually as a synonym for Syria in 1 Sam 14:47.[47] As for leopards and Assyria, *that* biblical link is supplied in Hos 13:7:

> ואהי להם כמו־שחל
> כנמר על־דרך אשור

> "And I will be to them like a lion,
> Like a leopard beside the way I will lie in wait."

The pun is not very subtle: אשור means both "I lie in wait" and "Assyria," yielding the double entendre, "Like a leopard beside the way—Assyria." Indeed, the verb is not common, and the LXX missed the pun entirely, translating אשור as Assyria.[48]

b. *"The Birds of the Sky"*

There remain to be identified the four birds of prey used by the *An. Apoc.* to depict Israel's Hellenistic overlords, an exercise that takes us beyond the pages of biblical history and deprives us of that handy key. All critics have recognized in these birds some kind of symbolization of Hellenistic dynasties,[49] but some have argued that the *An. Apoc.* is inconsistent, because

---

[47] The hyenas are also correctly identified as the Syrians by Martin (*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 216) and by traditional Ethiopian interpretation (marginalia at 89:10 in 2080, 2436: ሶር; 6974: ሶርያ).

[48] Again, Ethiopian tradition agrees with our assignments. Marginalia at 89:10 in 2080, 2436, and 6974 identify the lions as Babylon, ባቢሎን፡ (abbreviated ባቢ. or ባቢሎ) and the leopards as Assyria, ፋርስ፡ (sometimes abbreviated ፋር), although in the OT the latter term is used for both Assyria and Persia indiscriminately.

[49] A few critics have also suggested that they may symbolize individual leaders. Martin (*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 224) wants to identify the eagles and kites of 90:4 as Antigonus, Demetrius, and Ptolemy Soter, while Jonathan Goldstein (*1Maccabees*, 41 n. 12) thinks the birds of prey are all

it is alleged that at least some of the birds begin as symbols of Hellenistic invaders (90:2), but end up as symbols of the local enemies who fight against the Maccabean rebels (90:13–16).[50] A few critics have avoided this conclusion by dividing the birds so that some are Greeks and some are their local allies. These scholars all take the eagles for Graeco-Macedonians and the ravens for Seleucids (more on this below), but their interpretations of the falcons and kites are irreconcilable.[51] This whole approach is unsatisfactory, because the allegory leaves the distinct impression that the birds come together as invaders from afar (90:2: "I saw in my vision all the birds of the sky coming"). The raptors provide a vivid new image of both the swiftness of the Hellenistic conquerors and the utter helplessness of Judea against their assaults (90:2–4). Local enemies, on the other hand, are still depicted in the post-exilic era as quadrupeds: Edomite boars (89:72), Philistine dogs (90:4) and several references to "beasts" (90:18–19). For his part, Nickelsburg is content to assign the birds as a whole to the Hellenistic powers as a whole, and leave it at that. Identifying the birds more precisely is "problematic," and he abandons all such attempts to others.[52]

In my view, Nickelsburg's pessimism is unjustified. I believe that convincing identities for the four birds can be discovered with the help of a clue from the contemporary book of Daniel.[53] According to Daniel, Alexander the Great's domain was divided after his death into four kingdoms corresponding to the "four winds of heaven," that is, the four cardinal directions (Dan

---

various ranks of Seleucid officials, including individual villains known from 1Macc 3–5. But animal species always signify nations in the *An. Apoc*., as pointed out by VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 163 n. 65; and Tiller, *A Commentary*, 69.

[50] The battles with local enemies are described in 1Maccabees 5; 2Macc 10:14–38; and 12:10–45. Influenced by these, Charles suggests that the falcons [vultures] and kites begin as Graeco-Egyptians in 90:2 but change into Ammon and Edom by 90:13 (*Book of Enoch*, 209; *APOT* 2:258). Even more radical are Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 44) and, apparently, VanderKam (see *Enoch and the Growth*, 163), who read *all* of the birds in 90:16 as local enemies. With good reason, Bryan disputes such interpretations (*Cosmos*, 100).

[51] For Schodde, the "vultures" [falcons] and the "buzzards" [kites] are both local allies of the Greeks (*Book of Enoch*, 235). For Black, the falcons [vultures] are Ptolemaic Egyptians and the kites are "Israel's local enemies" (*Book of Enoch*, 274, 276). For Tiller the kites are the Ptolemaic Egyptians, and the falcons [vultures], if original to the *An. Apoc*., may possibly be "Hellenized Edom" (*A Commentary*, 345–346, 357).

[52] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 396. But see n. 55 below for a pointed exception.

[53] As a rule, it is methodologically hazardous to use one book to interpret another, but Daniel and the *An. Apoc*. are exact contemporaries, and Paul Porter has demonstrated that the two works utilize a common apocalyptic vocabulary reflecting a common cultural environment. He finds no less than 25 significant parallels between Daniel 7–9 and the *An. Apoc*. See Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8* (ConBOT 20; Uppsala: Gleerup, 1983), 43–60.

8:8, 21–22; 11:4). Although this four-fold division is artificial, Daniel's quartet appear to be the kingdoms of the Diadochi divided like this: (1) West: *Macedonia and Greece* (2) North: *Thrace and/or Anatolia* (3) East: *Syria and Babylon* (4) South: *Egypt*.[54] I suppose that for Jews with an inclination to see the world through the lens of apocalyptic symbolism, there was a certain poetic satisfaction in finding the surrounding Hellenistic powers configured in accordance with the four points of the compass, and this observation was perhaps part of the common apocalyptic vocabulary of the times. But if these four kingdoms supply a plausible key for identifying the four birds of *1En* 89:10, 90:2–19, which is which?

The eagles and ravens can be identified with a fair degree of confidence, and the kites only slightly less so. The eagles are listed first at the beginning of the Hellenistic era, and they are explicitly said to be "leading all the birds" (90:2). These two facts have persuaded most commentators to identify them, at least in their first appearances, as the Macedonians (or Graeco-Macedonians). The identification of the ravens as the Seleucids seems even more secure, since they are the primary and sometimes the only opponents of the sheep as the allegory moves into a description of the Maccabean revolt (90:8, 9, 12). They are also recognized by other foes of Israel in the allegory as their leaders during their struggles with Judas Maccabee (90:13). These identifications of the eagles and ravens are widely recognized.[55] The interpretation of the kites rests largely on 90:4:

---

[54] For the identifications, see, e.g., Montgomery, *Book of Daniel*, 332; Louis Hartmann and Alexander di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 235; J.E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Waco: Word, 1987), 295; and Collins, *Daniel*, 331.

[55] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 345–346. Others making these two identifications include Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 274); Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 235); Georg Beer (*APAT* 2, 295); Martin (*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 224); Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 205); Josef Schreiner (*Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik: Eine Einführung* [Biblische Handbibliothek 6; Munich: Kosel, 1969], 97); Black (*Book of Enoch*, 274); and Bryan (*Cosmos*, 99). The major dissenter is Nickelsburg, who follows a suggestion of Jonathan Goldstein and identifies the eagles as the Ptolemies, because Ptolemaic coins regularly featured a large eagle (*1Enoch 1*, 396). However, Macedonian coins under Perseus (179–167 BCE) and even Seleucid coins under Antiochus IV (in the years 169–168) also displayed large eagles and were minted in abundance. See, e.g., N. Breitenstein, *The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, Danish National Museum: Volume Two: Thrace and Macedonia* (Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum; West Milford: Sunrise Publications, 1982), plate 33: 1266–1281; and E.T. Newell, *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch* (Chicago: Obol International, 1978 [1914]), 25–27. Also, the most common coins of the day, even in the Seleucid empire, continued to be the Macedonian "Alexanders" (i.e., the silver drachm and tetradrachm), and these regularly pictured Zeus holding a small eagle in his outstretched hand (C. Howgego, *Ancient History from Coins* [London: Routledge, 1995], 50–52, plates 66–67; C. Seltman, *Greek Coins: A History of Metallic Currency & Coinage Down to the Fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms*

> And I watched until that flock had been devoured by the dogs and the eagles and the kites, and they left on them not a bit of flesh, or skin, or sinew; until only their bones were left standing. And even their bones fell to the ground. And the flock became few.[56]

As this verse appears to describe the first major period of domination by the birds of prey and makes no mention of the Seleucid ravens, by process of elimination the kites seem to be the best candidates for the Ptolemaic Egyptians. This is another widely held position, even though most of those who hold it include the falcons along with the kites in this identity.[57]

The falcons are more elusive, but lumping them in with the kites seems like a solution born of desperation. Tiller professes himself unable to identify them and suspects that they may not be original to the text, in part because they always appear in tandem with the eagles and lack an independent function.[58] But as we have seen, that argument has little force since even outside the *An. Apoc.*, **አው·ስት ፡** is invariably paired with **አንስርት ፡**. By a process of elimination, the falcons should correspond to Thrace and/or Anatolia, Daniel's fourth Successor kingdom. A simple historical outline of the Hellenistic occupation of Palestine would seem to support this. The usual order of presentation in the allegory is *eagles, falcons, kites, ravens* (89:10; 90:2; 90:13), and this lines up with the four major Hellenistic conquests/occupations:[59]

Date	Kingdom	Conqueror	Origin	*An. Apoc.* Symbol
332	Macedonia/Greece	Alexander	West	eagles
315	Thrace/Anatolia	Antigonus I	North	falcons
301	Egypt	Ptolemy I	South	kites
198	Syria	Antiochus III	East	ravens

[London: Spink & Son, 1977], 214–218). Seleucid monetary policy with regard to foreign currencies was quite liberal: S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire* (Berkeley: University of California, 1993), 63.

[56] For the presence here of the Macedonian eagles and Philistine dogs, see *General Comments* on 90:2–5 (pp. 204–207).

[57] Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 274) and Tiller (*A Commentary*, 346) distinguish the kites from the falcons [vultures] and identify only the former as the Ptolemies. Grouping the two birds together as Egyptians are Beer (*APAT* 2, 295); Martin (*Le livre d'Hénoch*, 224); Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 205); Schreiner (*Alttestamentliche-jüdische*, 97); and Bryan (*Cosmos*, 99).

[58] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 31–32, 346. His other arguments presume that the **አው·ስት ፡** are vultures.

[59] These are the *major* conquests/occupations only. If the author was aware of lesser ones, they were probably reckoned too short-lived for a broad-stroke outline. For example, Ptolemy held the land by force for five years before Antigonus (320–315), and managed to regain it for a few months in 312.

In the days of Daniel and the *An. Apoc.*, of course, the Hellenistic powers had dwindled to two: Seleucids and Ptolemies, Daniel's kingdoms of the "North" and "South" (Dan 11:4–6). There is no dispute that Alexander continued to be remembered (Dan 8:21–22; 1Macc 1:1–7), but it might fairly be asked whether a second-century Jewish author would recall the fifteen year Thracian/Anatolian chapter at all, let alone depict it as a distinctive variety of Hellenistic tyranny. By the same token, one could ask how such an author would know (or care) about the marriage between Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II, and Antiochus II in 252 BCE (Dan 11:6). The most obvious answer is that Daniel is simply parroting his source, a Greek history. Knowledge of the Thracian/ Anatolian interlude (315–301) could come to the author of the *An. Apoc.* in exactly the same way, and the author would have a good reason for alluding to the Thracian/ Anatolian occupation: the distinctly Anatolian and Thracian elements that were prominent in the aggressive atmosphere leading up to the Maccabean revolt and continued to be prominent into its opening years. Shortly before unleashing his great persecution, Antiochus IV appointed as governor of Jerusalem one Philip, "by birth a Phrygian" and said to be a barbarous and malicious man (2Macc 5:22–23). He brought in an army of Mysian troops in order to subjugate Jerusalem, which task they began with treachery and concluded with massacres and mass enslavement (2Macc 5:24–26; 1Macc 1:29–40). Some of these Mysians took up residence in the Jerusalem citadel (1Macc 1:33), and reportedly there were 5000 Mysian, 3000 Cilician, and 3000 Thracian mercenaries represented in Antiochus Epiphanes' military parade at Daphne in 165 (Polybius 30:25:3–5). On the basis of similarities between the unusual "Seron" and a number of attested Thracian names, Bezalel Bar-Kochva suggests that this first Seleucid military commander to attack Judas Maccabee (1Macc 3:13–25) was probably a Thracian and commanded a Thracian force.[60] Thracian cavalry served in Gorgias's army at the battle of Marisa (2Macc 12:35), and the manner in which the rider is introduced ("one of the Thracian horsemen") suggests to Bar-Kochva that Thracians may have manned the nearby garrison.[61] In short, the falcons more than earn their own spot on the list.

The biggest problem with these identifications is chronological. If the four species of birds represent Greeks of the four Successor kingdoms, how

---

[60] Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 133.

[61] Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 222.

is that *all four* are seen doing battle together against Israelite sheep in general (90:11) and against Judas the ram in particular (vv. 13–16) well into the Seleucid era, which begins in 90:6? Older critics tended to explain this oddity by pointing to the significant numbers of ethnically-diverse mercenaries known to have served the Seleucid kings, including Antiochus IV and his successors.[62] Even if we leave aside the local forces that have erroneously been included with the Greeks under the avian symbols, and focus rather on those Hellenic mercenaries who were imported from abroad (cf. 1 Macc 6:29; 2 Macc 13:2; Polybius 30:25:3–5), this solution still seems best. We have already met the abundant Thracian/ Anatolian falcons in Antiochus's service. The kites who reappear in 90:11 after an absence of seven verses may likewise be explicable as Graeco-Egyptian troops in the employ of the Syrians at the outbreak of the Maccabean revolt. While it is admittedly difficult to imagine Ptolemaic troops being made available for hire to the Seleucid monarchy so soon in the wake of the Sixth Syrian War,[63] it should be borne in mind that not all "Egyptian" troops had to come from Egypt.

The island of Cyprus passed to the Ptolemies after the death of Alexander, and with only two interruptions (306–294 under Demetrius Poliorcetes and briefly in 168 under Antiochus IV), the island remained part of the Ptolemaic empire throughout the entire Hellenistic era. Despite being part of "Egypt," Cyprian mercenaries hired themselves out to the highest bidders,[64] and we find them, for example, manning the Jerusalem citadel for the Seleucids in 172 (2 Macc 4:29). Others probably served under the Cypriarch Nicanor in 164 (2 Macc 12:2).[65] Cyprians like these may have been among the

---

[62] 1 Macc 3:10; 5:39; 6:29; 2 Macc 8:9; Polybius 30:25:3–5. For the "mercenary" explanation of the four birds in 90:11–19, see Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 279; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 209; and Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 226. It is still used in Black, *Book of Enoch*, 276; and Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 699.

[63] So Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 320 ("Hostile Ptolemaic Egypt surely sent no aid to the unsteady Seleucid regime of Lysias"). But Matthew Black sees no such difficulty (*Book of Enoch*, 276), and note also that Josephus depicts Egyptian troops operating freely on 2nd c. BCE Palestinian soil in his "Tobiad romance" (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:180). Josephus's much-maligned chronology here has found defenders in recent years: Daniel R. Schwartz, "Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?" in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (ed. M. Goodman; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 47–64; also Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSS 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 214–221.

[64] Marcel Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (2 vols; Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 1.169; Paris: E. de Boccard, 1949–1950), 1. 487–489.

[65] For Κυπριάρχης = "military commander of Cypriot forces" rather than "Governor of Cyprus" (so NRSV et al.), see Félix-Marie Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Études bibliques; Paris: Librarie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1949), 432; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 433; and Christian Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1.3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976), 261.

mercenaries "from the islands" gathered by Antiochus in 165 (Josephus, *Ant*. 12:293) and by his son Eupator in 161 (1Macc 6:29) in preparation for attacks on Judas. We know of a Cypriot military governor (στρατηγός) named Ptolemy Macron, who not only defected to Antiochus, but was conspicuously Egyptian (2Macc 10:12–13; Polybius 27:13).[66] Here would be the place to emphasize that if the *An. Apoc*. anticipates a pan-Hellenic assault against Israel as a prelude to the Day of the Lord (90:13–38; cf. Dan 7:23–27), membership requirements for inclusion in the coalition are going to be kept low. That is, if the author *wants* to find Graeco-Egyptians[67] in the mix, a regiment or two of Cyprian mercenaries in the Seleucid ranks may well suffice.

The eagles are less problematic. Macedonian garrisons were left in Palestine in the wake of Alexander's conquest, and a number of cities were established as Macedonian military colonies.[68] There are several references to "Macedonians" in the Seleucid armies, including those of Antiochus Epiphanes;[69] however, it has frequently been argued that the word has lost all ethnic content by the second century and has evolved into a strictly military term, designating native troops trained in the Macedonian arts of war, especially the phalanx.[70] Bar-Kochva argues that this common view is mistaken, and that the Seleucid phalanx at the time of the Maccabean revolt was still made up of ethnic Graeco-Macedonians, trained in Syrian military colonies.[71] If Bar-Kochva is correct, there is no reason at all to puzzle over the eagles in *1En* 90:11–16. But even if he is not,[72] it was both sound military policy and good propaganda for the Seleucids to evoke their Macedonian

---

[66] Polybius (27:13:1) is impressed with Ptolemy's character, which is "not at all like an Egyptian" (οὐδαμῶς Αἰγυπτιακός). The irony has no force unless there was something unmistakably Egyptian about Macron, and indeed, inscriptional evidence indicates that he was the son of an important Alexandrian family (T.B. Mitford, "Ptolemy Macron," in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* [ed. E.A. Milano: Casa editrice Ceschina, 1957], 182–184, 185). Although Macron himself was kindly disposed toward the Jews (2Macc 10:12–13), he is illustrative of how "Egyptians" could be taken into Seleucid service.

[67] That the author does *not* have in mind ethnic Egyptians is shown by the fact that earlier in the allegory, native Egyptians are depicted as wolves (89:13–27), and this is still the case in 89:55.

[68] Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 105–111; Schürer (Vermes) *History of the Jewish People*, 1. 144.

[69] For sources and statistics, see Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 33–34.

[70] Ibid., 90–92 (bibliography: 91 n. 4). Josephus discusses this phenomenon (*J.W*. 5:460–461).

[71] Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 92–111, 413–431.

[72] Susan Sherwin-White and Amélie Kuhrt remain unconvinced (*From Samarkhand to Sardis*, 212–214).

military heritage as ostentatiously as possible, through training, equipping, and even nomenclature, and this alone would have provided sufficient excuse for keeping eagles in the allegory.[73]

A final problem of interpretation involves the ravens. If these are indeed the Seleucids, how is it that they are listed as simply one of four species? "Raven" can hardly be used as an umbrella term to include other birds of prey. A possible clue is found in 90:13a: "And I watched until the shepherds, the eagles, the falcons, and the kites came, and they called upon the ravens to smash to bits the horn of that male sheep." First and Second Maccabees report several occasions in which representatives or associates of the Seleucid regime in Judea appeal to the Syrian governor (1Macc 4:26–27; 2Macc 8:8) or even to the king himself (1Macc 3:26–27; 6:21–22) for assistance against Judas. In these books local Seleucid power manifests itself as a motley crew of ethnically-diverse appointees, mercenaries, and local allies, sometimes assisted by apostate Jews (1Macc 3:10; 4:2, 12, 26; 5:1–68; 6:21; 2Macc 4:29; 5:22–26; 10:14–15). On the other hand, the regular Syrian forces based in Antioch seem to be distinguished from these (1Macc 3:13; 6:28–29; 7:39; 2Macc 11:1–4). It is probably these latter forces who are depicted as ravens in the *An. Apoc.*

[73] "Macedonians" in the Daphne parade carried shields of gold, brass, and silver (Polybius 30:25:5). Compare the description of the phalanx units arrayed against Judas in 1Macc 6:38–39.

CHAPTER SIX

GENESIS THROUGH KINGS (*1ENOCH* 85:2–89:58) TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

85:2–10: The First Generations of Humanity

85 2. Enoch spoke up and addressed his son Methuselah: I will speak to you, my son. Listen to my words! Incline your ear to your father's dream vision! 3. Before I married Edna your mother, I saw in a vision on my bed. And behold a bull emerged out of the earth, and that bull was white. And after it there emerged a heifer, a female, and along with her came two bull-calves, and one of them was black and the other red. 4. The black bull-calf struck the red one, and it pursued it over the earth. From then on I could not see the red calf. 5. But the black calf grew up, and a certain female heifer accompanied it. I saw that many cattle issued from it, and they resembled it and followed after it. 6. Then that female cow—the first one—went forth from the presence of that first bull. She searched for that red calf, but she could not find it. She lamented greatly over it, and she searched for it. 7. I watched until that first bull came to her and calmed her, and from then on she stopped crying. 8. And later she bore another white bull, and after him she bore many bulls and heifers, black ones. 9. I watched that white bull in my sleep, and it likewise grew up and became a large white bull, and from it issued many white cattle, and they resembled it. 10. These began to sire numerous white cattle that were similar to them, one following after the other.

Translation Notes

85:2 Enoch spoke up. Lit. "Enoch raised" (= raised his voice). So most MSS. This biblical idiom (Isa 3:7; 42:2) is also used in the first Dream Vision, in 83:5.

85:3 bull … heifer … bull-calf … cow. The Eth text uses multiple terms for male, female, adult and juvenile bovines, but there seems to be no thematic significance in the variations. Even if there were, the Ethiopic text is not a consistent indicator of the animal names in the Aramaic

original, as Tiller notes (*A Commentary*, 226). For a table of bovines and their translation equivalents, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 227.

85:5 a certain. For this use of the demonstrative pronoun ዝኩ፡ , see August Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar* (London, Williams & Norgate, 1907), 331, cited by Tiller (*A Commentary*, 228). The Ethiopic idiom is similar to an English idiom commonly heard in jokes: "This man walks into a bar …"

General Comments

This first portion of the *An. Apoc*., corresponding to Gen 1–5, is remarkable for what it omits and what it includes. Omitted are the creation of the world and of Eden and the sin of Adam and Eve, while the murder of Abel and its aftermath are given disproportionate space. By ignoring the creation of the world, the allegory signals from the beginning that the story of humanity will be the primary focus, and by ignoring the Garden of Eden (and its loss), the nature of salvation in the Eschaton is already being circumscribed: In the end, humanity does not recover a world or a paradise within the world so much as it recovers a *condition*, an idealized Adamic state. Since the "Book of the Watchers" mentions the sin and expulsion of Adam and Eve (32:6) and explores at length the future significance of Paradise (chaps. 24–26, 32), it is reasonable to suppose that the *An. Apoc*. dispenses with these deliberately. Eschatological salvation is portrayed as a recovery of the Adamic state, and this may explain why the allegory passes over the sin of Adam and harmonizes better with the "glory of Adam" theology found in a number of other Jewish writings.[1]

As discussed in Chapter Three (pp. 90–91), the *danger of fraternal hostility* is an important motif in the allegory, so it is not surprising that the first fratricide is highlighted. The "Book of the Watchers" had already elaborated Gen 4:10 and presented Abel as the prototype of innocent victimhood, crying for vengeance from the underworld (22:5–7), but the *An. Apoc*. restricts itself to a brief summary of the murder narrative itself, adding to it the detail of Cain's pursuit of Abel. This pursuit may be reflective of persecution[2] of the

[1] Both emphases are well represented in the literature of this period. For the "glory of Adam," see Sir 49:16; Philo, *Creation* 136–150; CD iii 18–20; 1QH xvii 15–16; and 1QS iv 23. The Qumranic examples are especially significant for our study since they promise the "glory of Adam" as an eschatological inheritance. For Adam as a catastrophic failure, see *Life of Adam and Eve* (= *Apocalypse of Moses*); Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 45–49; *2 Bar* 17:3; and *4 Ezra* 3:21.

[2] Compare *Qoh. Rab*. on 3:15: "Abel was pursued by Cain" (הבל נרדף מפני קין), cited in Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1453. *Pursue* also means *persecute* in all of the relevant languages.

reformers of the author's own day by their fellow Jews (perhaps in 90:6–7; more certainly in 90:16). If indeed the allegorist wished the readers to see a prefiguration of these persecutions in the story of Cain and Abel, perhaps he omitted the account of their contrasting sacrifices (Gen 4:3–5) in order to avoid anything that would imply that cultic disputes were at the root of the current internecine conflicts. In the allegory, this omission leaves *only* Cain's blackness as an explanation for his hostility, and here the allegorist's nuanced views of human motivation begin to emerge. Sometimes no rational motive for evil can be found. The wicked are born bad, and this can only be explained as a mystery of divine predestination. So some would argue. To judge by the example of Cain, the allegory seems to suggest that this analysis is not always wrong.

The emphasis on Eve's distress in the *An. Apoc*. is more difficult to explain.[3] She seems to be presented as a pathetic character, and a Jewish reader might spontaneously compare her to such figures as Rachel, weeping for her slain children (Jer 31:15), or the personified Jerusalem throughout the book of Lamentations. If a contemporary motivation is to be sought for including this otherwise unknown *haggada* about Eve, one could speculate that the allegorist is heaping shame upon those Jews who are willing to persecute and kill their own brethren by depicting such hostility as a heartless outrage against their common Mother Zion. In that case, Adam's success in comforting Eve might be said to foreshadow the end of all such sorrows with the advent of the Adamic white bull in the New Jerusalem. This is conjecture, but I am unable to offer a better explanation.

Explanatory Comments

85:2 The *An. Apoc*. begins with this verse, not 85:1, which is really the end of the first dream vision ("And after this I saw another dream, and I will show it all to you, my son"). Some scholars detect a redactional seam between 85:1 and 85:2, pointing to the changes in person, and they use this to argue

[3] The motif of mourning for Abel, based on the pun הבל/אבל, is found elsewhere (*Jub* 4:7; *Apoc. Mos*. 3:3), but other elements, like Eve's fruitless search for Abel and Adam's success in comforting her, are unparalleled. Several scholars have suspected that the former is a Jewish adaptation of a common myth formula (Demeter searching for Kore; Isis for Osiris, Anat for Ba'al). See Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 40 n. 26; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 229; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 372. Left unexplained is why the allegorist would want to import a tradition like this into the Genesis narrative.

for editorial interference and multiple authorship,[4] but this "seam" is only the result of an uncritical acceptance of the traditional Ethiopian chapter division, which assigns 85:1 to the beginning of the second vision. If 85:1 is given back to the first dream vision, the "seam" disappears.

85:3 **Before I married Edna**. No fully satisfactory explanation has been offered for Enoch's assurances here and in 83:2 that his dream visions took place before he married.[5] If Milik is correct, these notices allude to the temporary continence required by the rites of incubation.[6] One can also compare 90:39, at the end of the *An. Apoc*., which reads like a description of an incubation rite. In that case the narrative framework of both dream visions harmonizes with the Enoch/Jacob traditions associated with incubation rites at the Dan and Bethel sanctuaries, as discussed in Chapter One (p. 40).

And behold a bull emerged out of the earth. From the beginning, the reader is encouraged to "translate" the allegorical figures directly back to their biblical referents. Here, the pun between "Adam" (אדם) and "earth" (אדמה) of Gen 2:7 is preserved, even though the language which provides the pun is absent.

and that bull was white. There are no white bulls in the Hebrew scriptures. Klaus Koch raises the possibility that this image comes from Zoroastrianism, but without developing the suggestion.[7] The idea has merit. According to the *Bundahish* (the most important source for Zoroastrian mythology[8]), humanity springs from the preserved seed of a primordial man (*Bund*. 15), while all species of beneficent plants and animals spring from the preserved seed of a primordial white bull (*Bund*. 10; *Selections of Zadsparam* 2:6). The 282 species of animals so derived are organized into 14 groups (*Bund*. 14). Similarly, in the *An. Apoc*. the line of white cattle gives rise to 14 new species (89:10). But so far as I can see, the similarities end there, so if the author of the *An. Apoc*. has indeed borrowed a Zoroastrian symbol, he has emptied it of its mythological content. Perhaps the parallel "Adams" of

---

[4] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 98–99, 224–225; Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 370; Tite, "Textual and Redactional Aspects," 115.

[5] For a thorough discussion, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 231–232.

[6] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 42.

[7] K. Koch, "Response to 'The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in 1 Enoch,'" in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck; JSJSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1.44–55 (51).

[8] For ET, see *Sacred Books of the East* vol. 5 (ed. F. Max Müller; Oxford: Clarendon, 1879–1910).

Zoroastrianism (one for humans, another for animals and plants) suggested the idea of using one image as an allegorical symbol of the other.

85:4 The black bull-calf struck the red one, and it pursued it over the earth. It may well be that the verbal clauses have been transposed, but there is no need to correct the text beyond this,[9] particularly since the extra-biblical pursuit of Abel by Cain reappears in the *Hypostasis of the Archons* (a Nag Hammadi text that evidences Jewish influence) and in later rabbinic midrashim.[10]

85:8 another white bull. This description of Seth corresponds to זרע אחר ("another seed") in Gen 4:25.[11] By creating a semantic equivalence between "white bull" and "seed," the allegorist lays a foundation for an interpretation of the final white bull as the genuine seed of Abraham and therefore as the key to the future blessing of all nations (Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4).

and after him many bulls and heifers, black ones. Gen 5:3–4 reiterates the special status of Seth as the bearer of Adam's image and informs us that Adam lived another 800 years after Seth's birth. Only then does it add, seemingly as an afterthought, that he had other sons and daughters. The implied distinction Genesis makes between Adam's elect and non-elect offspring is made explicit in the allegory by depicting the other siblings as black, the same color as Cain. Either the *An. Apoc.* is reflecting extra-biblical traditions about the wickedness of Adam's other children,[12] or the allegorist is using "black" in this case as an emphatic way of saying, "not white" (i.e., not elect).

85:10 similar to them, one following after the other. Tiller points out that this expression (or the similar) occurs several times in chapter 85, and that in each case it corresponds precisely to a genealogy in Gen 4–5.[13]

---

[9] See Tiller (*A Commentary*, 227) for the numerous emendations scholars have suggested.

[10] *Hyp. Arch.* 91.20–21: "And fleshly Cain pursued Abel his brother." For rabbinic use, see n. 2 above.

[11] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 21.

[12] There is a large body of Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic traditions ascribing demonic paternity to one or another of the siblings of Seth. Most often Cain alone has a demon father (e.g. *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 4:1; *Pirqe R. El.* 21; *Gos. Phil.* 61:5–10; possibly 1John 3:10–12); but sometimes Abel and/or the other siblings do also (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 24:6; *Orig. World.* 117; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 40.5.3). Nickelsburg points to the first set of material and argues that Cain's blackness and wickedness in the *An. Apoc.* may well imply demonic fatherhood (*1 Enoch 1*, 356, 371, 380–381). He does not explain why blackness would imply this in the case of Cain but not in the case of his siblings (85:8) or Noah's son Japheth (89:9, *apud* Nickelsburg), nor does he explain why the allegorist would be reluctant to describe these demonic activities openly.

[13] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 229. *1En* 85:5 = Gen 4:17–24; *1En* 85:8 = Gen 5:4; *1En* 85:9 = Gen 5:6–8; *1En* 85:10 = Gen 5:9–32.

By devoting such strict attention to the genealogical notices, the allegory signals that this will be a noteworthy element in the historical review. By designating the genealogical lines *by color*, the allegory encourages the reader to regard whiteness as the sure sign of election. With the white cattle, it is not being bovine but being white that counts. It is important to recognize this, because the line of election runs through the allegory not as a species but as a color. Election has an attributive rather than a predicative quality, making it easier to recognize distinctions within the community of physical descendants. Sheep are generally white, but not *all* sheep are white, or completely white (cf. 90:6), and the allegory suggests that cleanliness and good health enhance the whiteness of those that are (cf. 90:32).

86:1–87:1: The Fall of the Watchers and the Birth of the Giants

86 1. Again, while looking upwards with my eyes in my sleep, I saw the sky above me, and behold a particular star fell from the sky down into the midst of the large cattle, where it began eating and grazing among them. 2. Behold, then I looked at the large and the black cattle, and behold they all changed their pastures, their stables, and their calves; and they began to moan with each other. 3. Again I saw in the vision, and I looked at the sky, and behold I saw that many stars descended, and they were led astray from the sky by that first star. And among those calves they became bulls, and they were grazing with them in their midst. 4. And I looked at them, and saw, and behold they all let out their private parts like horses and began to mount the cows of the bulls. And they all became pregnant and bore elephants, camels, and donkeys. 5. And all of the cattle were afraid of them, and terrified by them, and they began to bite with their teeth, and to devour, and to gore with their horns. 6. And they started to eat the cattle. And behold all of the children of the earth began trembling and shaking in their presence, and they were fleeing. **87** 1. Again, I saw how they began to gore each other, and to devour each other, until the entire earth began to cry aloud.

Translation Notes

86:2 the large and the black cattle. The Ethiopic construction is ambiguous as to whether this means one group, "the large, black cattle," or two groups, respectively "the large cattle" and "the black cattle." See *Explanatory Comments* on 86:2.

86:3 they were led astray … by that first star. With the exception of Knibb (*Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2. 197), translators have read the verb as reflexive: "they cast themselves down … to that first star." Better to read **ተገድፉ ፡** as a simple passive ("they were cast away"), which can also mean, "they went astray" (Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 181). In tandem with a passive verb, the preposition **በኀበ ፡** here indicates agency (Lambdin, *Introduction*, 89). See *General Comments* below.

General Comments

This section is not without interpretive difficulties, but if my reading is sound, it depicts in three episodes the progressive corruption of the antediluvian world: (1) the infiltration of the Sethites by Asael, (2) the intermingling of the Sethite and Cainite lines, and (3) the mating of the Watchers with human women, resulting in monstrous and violent offspring. The first episode may reflect a traditional source, since something similar is detectible in Josephus.[14] The second episode introduces a plot element that reappears later in Christian writings, starting in the second century.[15] The third episode is a summary of the parallel account in "Book of the Watchers" (*1En* 6–8).

The story of Asael (with his forbidden teachings) and the story of Shemihazah (with his gang of Watchers intent on marriage) are woven together into a single narrative in *1En* 6–8 but presented separately in the *An. Apoc*.,

[14] Josephus paints an extravagant portrait of the villainy of the Cainites and the virtue of the Sethites, who nevertheless fall deeply into sin (*Ant*. 1. 60–74). The specific language he uses hints at some kind of causal connection between the corruption of the Sethites and the angelic transgression of Gen 6:1–2. The Sethites "no longer rendered to God His due honours, nor took account of justice towards men, but displayed by their actions a zeal for vice twofold greater than they had formerly shown for virtue, and thereby drew upon themselves the enmity of God. For (γὰρ) many angels of God now consorted with women and begat sons who were overbearing and disdainful of every virtue …" (*Ant*. 1.72–73; trans. Thackeray, LCL).

[15] Julius Africanus (ca. 160–ca. 240) interprets Gen 6:1–2 as referring to Sethites and Cainites, the latter provoking God by their intermingling (ἐπιμιχθέντων αὐτῶν), presumably with the Sethites. The seduction of the Sethites by the Cainites—literally and spiritually—becomes by the fifth century the dominant Christian exegesis of Gen 6:1–4, displacing the older angelic interpretation. See William Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989), 117–119; and L.R. Wickham, "The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men: Genesis VI 2 in Early Christian Exegesis," in *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis* (ed. J. Barr; OtSt 19; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 135–147.

perhaps reflecting an older version of the Watcher myth.[16] By presenting Asael as the original corrupter of the Sethite line, traditional stories contrasting the histories of the Sethites and Cainites can be incorporated into an Enochic account of antediluvian corruption for the first time. The reason for doing so may be something as simple as a desire to present a narrative that can be owned by a variety of Jewish readers, including those who perhaps favored an exegesis of Gen 4–5 with a different focus than the traditional Enochic one.[17] It is also possible, however, that the new material serves a thematic purpose consistent with the interests of the *An. Apoc*. Compared to the "Book of the Watchers," the *An. Apoc*. places a strong emphasis on human sin, which runs consistently through its account of the antediluvian age. Angelic sin is still emphasized in that the Sethites have been infiltrated by Asael and have presumably fallen under the influence of his teaching (cf. *1En* 8:1–2), and the sin of the Watchers in taking human wives is still depicted as the central catastrophe of the era, leading as it does to intolerable levels of violence; but at the same time, Cain has murdered Abel, the Sethites have corrupted themselves by mingling with the Cainites, and some of the cattle have joined in with the offspring of the Watchers and contributed to the violence. This latter point can be inferred from the observations in 86:5 and in 87:1 that some of the animals began *goring each other with their horns*, a detail that cannot refer to the camels, donkeys, or elephants, who spring from the union of "stars" (Watchers) and "cows" (human women), but can only refer to the cattle. It is true that the "Book of the Watchers" also presents humans as both innocent victims and guilty participants in the explosion of wickedness before the Flood,[18] but in that earlier treatment there is far more emphasis on evil as a demonic intrusion into the world. The narrative of *1En* 6–16 is dominated not by concern with human wickedness but with the catastrophic sin of the Watchers and their punishment.

---

[16] For details, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 89–90; and Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 372–373.

[17] See the discussion of the allegory's diplomatic character in Chapter Three (pp. 92–97).

[18] In *1En* 7–8, some humans are killed by the giants (7:4; 8:4), while others become students of the Watchers' teachings and contribute to the overall wickedness (8:1–2). It might be inferred that the first group consciously rejected the teachings (like Noah in *1En* 65:6–11) and paid for it with martyrdom. This would provide a justification for the extermination of all humanity but Noah in the Flood: By that point, all the righteous were already dead! The division of humanity into two groups, one killed and the other not, is even clearer if one accepts Milik's reconstruction of the Aramaic fragments of 8:4 and translates, "And as part of humanity was perishing from the earth, their voice went up to heaven" (see Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 160). This reconstruction, however, is adventuresome and problematic (Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 190).

As discussed in Chapter Three (pp. 91–92), another important theme in the *An. Apoc.* is *the importance of strong leadership*, and the theme makes its debut in the allegory with a negative example: The Watchers are led astray by Asael, and so they descend to join him, with disastrous consequences. The allegorist will bring forward from Israel's history a number of examples of good leadership leading to positive results, but we will see that dynamic leadership, as powerful and valuable as it is, does not dilute the moral responsibility of those who are led. Asael will be singled out for special mention at the final judgment, but the Watchers who followed him will suffer the same fate (90:21–24).

As previously noted, the color-coding in these episodes loses its potency as an emblem of stark determinism, since the white cattle go astray and mingle with the black, making the two groups indistinguishable in their moral standing and equally ripe for judgment in the coming Flood. It is perhaps for this reason that the allegorist drops the epithet "white" and repeatedly refers to the Sethites simply as "large" (86:1–2). As they lose their virtue by falling under the sway of Asael and mingling with the Cainites, their whiteness loses its symbolic import. Having acknowledged in the case of Cain that color-determinism has a certain explanatory power, that same color-determinism is now subordinated to other moral dynamics at work in the allegory.

Explanatory Comments

86:1 a particular star fell from the sky down into the midst of the large cattle, where it began eating and grazing among them. That this star is Asael is proven by comparing 88:1 and 10:4–5. The text suggests that Asael (a "star") takes on human form ("eating and grazing among them" like a bovine), which implies a deceptive infiltration. The *An. Apoc.* does not specify whether Asael's crime consists of wicked teachings (as in the "Book of the Watchers"; cf. 8:1–2) or in influencing the Sethites toward mingling with the Cainites in the following verse, but the fact that he is indeed doing something criminal is confirmed at the great judgment (90:21–24).

86:2 After that I looked at the large and the black cattle, and behold they all changed their pastures, their stables, and their calves; and they began to moan with each other. Tiller's argument that only the Cainites are involved here ("large, black cattle") is grammatically unobjectionable but has little else to recommend it.[19] The epithet "large" points to

[19] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 237–239.

the Sethites.[20] Tiller also finds difficulties with the final verb, but even though ⲟⲱ·ϥⲱ ⸗ is usually translated "lament," "howl," "wail," it sometimes translates βοάω, ἀναβοάω, or κράζω, and these could be used of the bellowing of a bovine in heat (hence, "moan"), which provides admirable sense.[21] Tiller's interpretation is also problematic in that it leaves the Sethites uncorrupted, and therefore their disappearance from the narrative and their presumed extermination in the Flood (except for Noah) are left unexplained.[22]

86:5–87:1 ... bite with their teeth, and to devour, and to gore with their horns. And they started to eat the cattle ... they began to gore each other, and to devour each other. The allegory dwells at length on the horrendous violence of the antediluvian world. The vagueness of the subject in these sentences ("they"), which fails to distinguish clearly between the offspring of the Watchers (camels, donkeys, elephants) and renegade cattle (the animals goring with their horns), *may* be a deliberate literary choice, reflecting the violence of the allegorist's own day, early in the Maccabean wars, when Jewish collaboration with the Seleucids made it difficult to tell friend from foe. Compare the "wild sheep" of 90:16.

86:6 all of the children of the earth. Some scholars criticize this as an absent-minded slip into non-symbolic language,[23] but more probably it is a simple Hebraism. In the Hebrew scriptures בן is freely used in constructions to refer to animals as well as humans. When the construction consists of בן + a habitat, it is the species that is indicated.[24] Hence, "all the children of the earth" does not depart from animal language, but it does emphasize the common and earthly humanity of the victims over against the alien

---

[20] Seth is described as "large" in 85:9, and his descendants are expressly said to resemble him.

[21] This is the tack taken by Uhlig (*Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 680) and Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 367).

[22] Nickelsburg briefly mentions this difficulty with Tiller's interpretation (*1Enoch 1*, 373). The problem created by restricting the corruption to the Cainites was already discussed by Newsom in 1975 ("Enoch 83–90," 40 n. 28).

[23] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 188 ("the author here forgets his rôle, and uses non-symbolical language"); Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 374 ("a unique departure from his animal symbolism"). Tiller agrees that "the language is not symbolic," unless the phrase refers not to humans but to animals (*A Commentary*, 241).

[24] As opposed to בן + an animal, which indicates younglings. Cattle are frequently referred to as בני בקר, "children of the herd" (Gen 18:7–8; Lev 9:2; 12:6; Num 15:8–9; 1Sam 14:32). The locution פר בני בקר, "bull, son of the herd" occurs more than 30 times. See *BDB*, 121. The inner logic of the construction seems to have been recognized by users, enabling the author of Psalm 114 to coin a unique term for sheep: בני צאן, "children of the flock" (vv. 4, 6), apparently by analogy with בני בקר.

Watchers and their hybrid offspring. The one time that "children of the earth" is used in the "Book of the Watchers" (15:3) confirms this. Addressing the fallen Watchers, God says:

> For what purpose have you abandoned the high, holy, eternal heaven, and lain with women, and defiled yourselves with the daughters of men, taking wives for yourselves, doing as the **children of earth** do, and begetting giant sons?

Charles read the phrase in 86:6 more perceptively in his first edition than in his second, commenting that "children of the earth" refers to "those of purely human descent as opposed to the watchers and their children."[25]

87:2–89:1: The Seven Archangels and the First Judgment

87 2. And I raised my eyes again to the sky, and in the vision behold I saw descending from the sky beings who were like white men. Four emerged from that place, and three with them. 3. And those three who had emerged last seized me by the hand and took me up away from the sons of the earth. And they lifted me up to a lofty place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were lower. 4. Then they told me: "Remain here until you witness everything that is to happen to those elephants, camels, and donkeys, and to those stars, and to the cattle—to all of them." 88 1. Then I looked at one of those four who had emerged first, and he seized that first star that had fallen from the sky. He bound him by his hands and feet and hurled him into an abyss, and that abyss was narrow and deep and desolate, and (a place of) darkness. 2. And one of them drew a sword and gave it to those elephants and camels and donkeys. They proceeded to strike each other, and because of them the whole earth trembled. 3. And as I watched in my vision, behold one of those four who had emerged came down from the sky and gathered up and took away the many stars whose private parts were like those of horses, and he bound them all, hands and feet, and he hurled them into a chasm of the earth. 89 1. Then one of those four went to one of the white bulls and taught it *a mystery, without his trembling. He was born a bull, but he became a man.*

---

[25] Charles, *Book of Enoch* (1893), 229. Charles is amplifying Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 257: "*Children of the earth*] in contrast to the heavenly stars and their descendants" ("*Kinder der Erde*] im Gegensatz gegen die himmlischen Sterne und ihre Nachkommen"). So too Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 226), who points out that the Watchers are called the "children of heaven" in *1En* 6:2.

And he built for himself a ship, and he stayed on board, and three bulls also entered with him into the ship. And the ship was closed up and covered over them.

Translation Notes

88:1 desolate, and (a place of) darkness. The MSS offer a variety of possibilities for the third adjective, with "desolate" (*g, t*, 2080*, 7584, 2436), "desolation" (*m, u*, 6281), and "harsh" (most Eth 2) enjoying the strongest manuscript support. Tana has "enclosed" and *q* has "wormy." Since all of these are similarly spelled, the variants are probably the result of inner-Ethiopic corruption. If "desolation" is correct, the line should be translated: "that abyss was narrow and deep, and (a place of) desolation and darkness."

88:2 to those elephants and camels and donkeys. All Eth 1 except *t* and 6281 omit "and camels." 2436 has a unique reading: "to those elephants and to those donkeys and camels."

88:3 one of those four who had emerged came down from the sky. I follow the reading of 2080* and 4437, which have "came down" (**ወረደ፡**) where all other MSS have "threw" (**ወገረ**). The latter can mean "stone," and translators have generally followed that line of interpretation, assuming that the object of the verb has been lost. Nickelsburg maintains that the majority text is sufficient as it is, and he translates "hurled stones," appealing to Dillmann for proof that **ወገረ፡** can mean, "to stone," without explicit mention of projectiles (Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 364, 367; citing Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 936). But this is only true if another object is present for the verb (i.e., the stoning victim), which is not the case here.[26] One MS (*n*) does supply an object (**ሰይፈ፡** "sword"); all other MSS with **ወገረ፡** must be regarded as defective. While the minority reading could be an *ad hoc* scribal emendation, it makes sense as it stands and is able to explain the majority text as a confusion of similar-looking words.

89:1–8 The *italicized text* represents material in the Eth version missing from the one surviving Aramaic copy, which is fairly well preserved until verse seven. As usual, I have followed Tiller's reconstruction of the

---

[26] In his commentary (*Das Buch Henoch*, 257), Dillmann says that **ወገረ፡** is never used intransitively to his knowledge, and that the projectiles in 88:3 have probably been omitted by mistake ("*wagara* ist meines Wissens nie intransitiv, kann also nicht heissen: 'er fuhr vom Himmel herab.' Das Object dazu ist hier, wohl nur durch einen Fehler, ausgelassen, etwa: Werkzeuge, um sie damit zu bezwingen").

Aramaic (*A Commentary*, 162–164, 259–267), which tends to be shorter than Milik's for this portion of the text (Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 238–242). Tiller's reconstruction is closer to Klaus Beyer's (*Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, 243–244).

89:1 without his trembling. The evidence is evenly split between Eth MSS that say the bull *did* tremble (*m, t*, Tana, 2436, 2080^{c}, Eth 2) and those that say he *did not* (2080*, *g, q, u*, 1768, 6281, 7584). Either reading could be right. It may be noted that Nickelsburg's presentation of the MS evidence is incomplete (*1 Enoch 1*, 368).

General Comments

Next in the allegory, Enoch sees own his translation in his vision. As Tiller demonstrates, the "lofty place" to which he is taken is paradise (the garden of righteousness, or Eden), which is located on the mountain of God, a vantage point from which Enoch can see the heavenly temple (the "high tower").[27] The existence of this temple is thematically important, since it helps to explain the allegory's indifference about the ultimate fate of the Jerusalem Temple and the lack of any temple in the New Jerusalem. Since the New Jerusalem is described as "loftier" than its predecessor (90:29), it may be conceived as standing on the mountain of God (Zech 8:3), or it may have risen to lofty heights (Ezek 40:2; Isa 2:1; Mic 4:1), in which case there is no need for any temple other than the perfect, heavenly one that Enoch is privileged to see.[28]

Like Jacob in his ladder vision at Bethel, Enoch in his dream sees angels ("white men" in the allegorical code) descending and ascending, and like Daniel in his "Son of Man" vision, Enoch sees himself as an actor in his own dream (see Dan 7:16). As previously noted, these kinds of significant Enochic parallels are relegated to the narrative framework of the *An. Apoc*. rather than the historical review itself.

The narrative of the missions of the four angels (88:1–89:1) stays close to its source, *1 En* 10:1–12 in the "Book of the Watchers," and it calls for little commentary here. The main difference is that Sariel's commission to instruct Noah has been moved from first to last place, where it fits more naturally as a prelude to the allegory's narration of the Flood.

---

[27] See Tiller, *A Commentary*, 248–250, for a detailed analysis. These traditions are logically consistent with the traditions about Enoch's ultimate destination throughout the Enochic corpus. For further discussion, see also Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 266–268.

[28] The thought is quite similar to *2 Bar* 4:1–6. The "real" temple is in paradise, and God has shown it to a select few like Adam, Abraham, and Moses.

Explanatory Comments

87:2 Four emerged from that place, and three with them. By splitting the angels into two groups, the tension within the Enochic tradition between four archangels (chaps. 9, 10, 40) and seven (chap. 20; 81:5) is resolved.

89:1 Then one of those four went to one of the white bulls and taught it a mystery, without his trembling. He was born a bull, but he became a man. Since final salvation in the *An. Apoc.* consists of animals returning to a perfected white cattle status, it is unexpected to find a white bull here—and a sheep later in 89:36—turning into a man (i.e., becoming an angel). Unfortunately, this potentially important verse bristles with unsolved problems. The extant Aramaic version appears to omit everything after "taught," leading Tiller to suspect that the latter part of the verse is secondary, written in imitation of 89:36. But it is equally likely that these lines in 89:1 are part of an early "second edition" that included an expanded Flood narrative, and that they should therefore be accepted as part of the *An. Apoc.* (see *General Comments* on 89:2–9 below). The significance of Noah's angelic transformation is elusive, however. It is not possible to decide whether Noah did or did not tremble, thanks to the divided manuscript evidence, and it cannot be determined from the vague comments in 89:9 whether his transformation was temporary or permanent. So long as these issues remain irresolvable, interpretations of this verse must remain tentative.

It is striking that Noah and Moses are both transformed into angels immediately before they engage in building projects: the Ark in 89:1 and the Tabernacle in 89:36. Because of this, the most popular explanation for the metamorphoses has been that the allegorist simply wished to avoid the absurd image of an animal wielding tools,[29] but this argument is effectively countered by pointing to the temple-building sheep of 89:72–73 and the sword-wielding animals of 88:2 and 90:19. According to *1En* 67:2 in the "Parables," the Ark was built by angels. If this tradition was current in the days of the *An. Apoc.*, Noah's angelic metamorphosis could be explained as an attempt to find a way to reconcile that tradition with the claims in Genesis that Noah built the Ark. This neat solution is frustrated by the fact that no similar legend about angelic construction of the Tabernacle is known.[30] In like manner, but this time in reverse, there are abundant contemporary traditions about Moses achieving angelic status, potentially

[29] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 257; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 203; Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 228, 231; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 190; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 267.

[30] According to one very late midrash, the Tabernacle constructed itself (*Exod. Rab.* 52:4).

explaining the *An. Apoc.* account as simply another version of that, but there is nothing precisely like it with regard to Noah.[31] The verse remains problematic.

The "mystery" taught to Noah is most likely the news of the coming Flood and his special role in preserving the future (cf. 10:1–3; chap. 65). As Martin points out, news of the deluge is also revealed to the hero of the Flood in the Gilgamesh epic as a mystery of the gods,[32] so this could be one of several places where the *An. Apoc.* has augmented Genesis with details derived from Mesopotamian Flood traditions.[33]

If Noah is trembling, it could be a natural response to an angelophany. In a Noah apocalypse of unknown date that is now incorporated into the "Parables," Noah does indeed tremble violently (60:3). On the other hand, if Noah does not tremble, this could simply be a way of contrasting him with the rest of the "children of the earth," who have been reduced to a pitiful state of trembling, terrified victimhood (86:6).

89:2–9: The Flood

89 2. Once again I looked *up towards the sky*, and I noticed *a lofty roof with* seven sluices *upon it, and the sluices were* pouring out *large quantities of* water *into an enclosed area*. 3. *I looked again*, and behold chambers opened up on the ground *within that great enclosure*, and water began to *boil up and* rise *above the ground*. And I continued to watch *that enclosure* until *all of* the ground was covered with water. 4. *Water*, and darkness, and *mist increased upon it*. *I kept watching the water level until* the water *rose over the enclosure, spilling over the enclosure, and it* was standing *upon the ground* [Aram: upon it]. 5. And *all* the cattle *of that enclosure* were *huddled together, until I saw them* submerging and drowning and dying in that water. 6. But the ship floated upon the water, while all of the cattle, elephants, camels, and donkeys sank *to the bottom along with all the animals, and I could no longer see them. They were unable to escape, and they perished, sinking* into

---

[31] For the angelic Moses, see 4Q*377* 1 ii 10–12; Ezekiel the Tragedian, *Exagoge* 70–76; and especially Sir 45:2 ("He made him equal in glory to the holy ones"). There are traditions assigning angelic status to Noah too, but in these his superhuman identity manifests itself at *birth*, not later (*1 En* 106–107; 1QapGen ii).

[32] Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 203.

[33] See the *Explanatory Comments* below on 89:4 and 89:9 (pp. 162–163). Black (*Book of Enoch*, 262) takes this as evidence for the authenticity of these lines in 89:1, despite their absence from 4Q*206*.

the depths. 7. Then again, in my dream, I watched until the sluices withdrew *from that lofty roof*, and the openings of the underground chambers closed up, while other chambers were opened, 8. and the water began to drain down into them, until the water ceased, and the earth was seen, and the vessel settled upon the ground. The darkness retreated and there was light. 9. Then that white bull which had become a man came out of that vessel with the three bulls that were with it. And one of those three bulls was white—resembling that bull—and one of them was red like blood, and one was black. And that one, that white bull, departed from them.

Translation Notes

89:2–7 For the *italicized text*, see the note on 89:1.

89:8–9 Most of 89:8–10 is lost in the lacunae of the fragmentary Aramaic text, so it should not be inferred from the lack of italics in these verses that the Aramaic necessarily agrees with the Ethiopic.

89:9 And that one, that white bull, departed from them. With the exception of Tiller, translators have ignored the double demonstrative, but it may represent an effort to distinguish between the two white bulls of the verse, perhaps to clarify that it is Noah who departs, not Shem. If so, the effort was less than successful.

General Comments

The first issue that needs to be addressed is the status of the longer and fuller Ethiopic version of 89:1–8. Despite the discovery of a shorter Aramaic text, some scholars continue to treat the Ethiopic version with respect, suspecting that it could go back to a different Aramaic recension with credible claims to originality.[34] As it happens, the particular Aramaic copy that covers 89:1–8 (4Q*206*) overlaps another copy (4Q*205*) for 89:11–14, and within that small overlap there are two places (in 89:11 and in 89:13) in which 4Q*206* has a shorter text. In may be significant that in those two places the Ethiopic reflects the longer text attested in 4Q*205*.[35]

---

[34] Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 262–263; Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 192. Tiller is skeptical but not dismissive of this perspective, acknowledging points in its favor (*A Commentary*, 258, 261).

[35] All the relevant evidence is conveniently presented in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 167–168, 269–270.

With regard to the contents of the two recensions, the longer version describes a roofed enclosure (ዐፀድ፡) with high walls which is filled from above and below until the creatures within it drown.[36] The shorter text more closely resembles the biblical account, in which the earth is simply covered with water. Nickelsburg points out that there is biblical precedent for picturing the world as a building (Job 38:4–11; Ps 104:2–9),[37] but the description of the Flood in the longer text of *1En* 89:2–8 is unique, calling for some kind of explanation. Two clues have been overlooked that may be helpful in this regard.

First, commentators have failed to take note of the irony in the image. Elsewhere in the allegory an enclosure (ዐፀድ፡) is presented as a place of peace and safety (89:34–36). In the longer Flood narrative, a place that would ordinarily provide security for the animals becomes a death trap. Secondly, the walls of this enclosure are unusually high for a cattle pen. By the time it overspills the top, the water is deep enough to drown all animals, and they are described as sinking into the depths, out of Enoch's sight. These two observations may point to an explanation for the image. There were grisly military incidents early in the Maccabean conflict in which enemies of Judas were trapped inside their own fortress towers and burned alive (1Macc 5:4–5; 2Macc 10:32–36). It is at least possible that these dramatic events suggested to the author of the *An. Apoc.* a more vivid and ironic way of imaging the Flood, showing how the same fate overtook the wicked of old, but with water rather than fire. When the *An. Apoc.* was revised in order to keep abreast of developments in the Maccabean conflict (see *General Comments* on 90:13–19, pp. 216–218), the author may have used that opportunity to revisit the Flood narrative. In that case, the Ethiopic version of the Flood goes back to the "second edition" of the *An. Apoc.*

Whether one opts for the shorter or the longer text, however, the description of the Flood goes well beyond the biblical narrative. In general, the allegory has been much more free with the biblical record up to and including the Flood than it will be afterwards. This may reflect an attempt to find common ground in conversation with other Jews. It would have been a non-negotiable claim that Enochic Jews had more written revelation about the antediluvian world than Genesis provides, but from Noah onward, there may have been greater consensus between Enochic and non-Enochic Jews about the completeness and adequacy of the historical record as found in

[36] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 258.
[37] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 376.

the Torah and the Former Prophets. This would be one possible explanation for the fact that the allegory sticks closer to the biblical text after it is finished with Noah.

Explanatory Comments

89:4 darkness. See also verse eight: "The darkness retreated and there was light." Genesis says nothing about darkness at the Flood and light returning afterwards, but this was a stock feature in Mesopotamian Flood stories.[38] This rather clear instance of a borrowed Mesopotamian detail makes the suggestion more palatable that Noah in the *An. Apoc*. is modeled on Mesopotamian Flood heroes as well as Noah in the Genesis account. As already noted, at his first appearance in the allegory he hears news of the coming Flood as a "mystery" (89:1), as did Uta-napishti and Atra-hasis.[39] As his final act in the allegory, he departs from humanity (89:9), as did Ziusudra, Uta-napishti and Xisouthros.[40] In addition, it will be recalled that the white bull image may have been borrowed from Zoroastrianism (see *Explanatory Comments* on 85:3, pp. 148–149). If these observations are sound, they suggest that the allegorist was not averse to reading and utilizing Gentile mythological literature, even if he was violently opposed to the encroachments of Gentile religion, as argued earlier (see pp. 87–90).

89:6 all of the cattle, elephants, camels, and donkeys sank to the bottom along with all the animals. Beyond the four listed, there are no "animals" (i.e., humans, giants) during this age, so "with all the animals" probably refers to literal animals. This is not a lapse into non-symbolic language, as is sometimes claimed.[41] ወዅሉ ፡ እንስሳ ፡ = וכל חיתא, which would be better translated in this context: "as well as every (other) living thing."

89:9 Then that white bull which had become a man came out of that vessel with the three bulls that were with it. And one of those three bulls was white—resembling that bull—and one of them was red like blood, and one was black. And that one, that white bull, departed from them.

---

[38] For the texts, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 263. The *An. Apoc*. is not unique in its willingness to augment Gen 7–8 with motifs derived from Mesopotamia. The Flood narrative of *Sib. Or*. 1:217–241, also a Jewish writing, contains the darkness-and-light motif as well as other echoes of Mesopotamian Flood stories. On this, see John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1. 214.

[39] *Gilgamesh* xi 9–10 (Uta-napishti); *Gilgamesh* xi 196–197 (Atra-hasis, here another name for Uta-napishti).

[40] *Sumerian Flood Story* vi 254–256, 259–260 (Ziusudra); *Gilgamesh* xi 205–206 (Uta-napishti); *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (Jacoby, *FHC* iii C, 380, 402) (Xisouthros).

[41] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 23 n. 51; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 264.

Newsom argues for the majority view that the red bull is Japheth and the black bull is Ham; Nickelsburg argues the reverse. Newsom seems to me to have the better argument.[42]

It is impossible to determine with certainty whether Noah remains a man or turns back into a white bull, but the latter seems to give better sense since Shem, his white-bull son, is said to resemble him. It is also uncertain whether it is Noah or Shem who departs at the end of the verse. In favor of Noah is the similar disappearance of Mesopotamian Flood heroes at this point, as discussed above, as well as the general Enochic tendency to focus on Noah (*1 En* 10:2–3; 65:11–12; 67:1–3; 106–107).

89:10–14: Noah to Joseph

89 10. They began to engender the beasts of the fields, and the birds, and from them it came about that there was every kind of species: lions, leopards, wolves, dogs, hyenas, wild boars, foxes, hyraxes, swine, swifts, eagles, falcons, kites, {phoenixes,} and ravens. And among these there was born a white bull. 11. And they began to bite each other and to seize each other. And the white bull which had been born among them sired a wild donkey—and a white bull-calf with it—and the wild donkeys multiplied. 12. But the [white] bull-calf which had been sired by [the white bull] sired a black wild boar and a white ram of the flock. And the wild boar sired numerous wild boars, while the ram sired twelve lambs. 13. And when those twelve lambs had grown up, they handed over one of their own to the wild donkeys. Those wild donkeys in turn gave that lamb to the wolves, and the lamb grew up in the midst of wolves. 14. Then the ram led forth all of the eleven lambs to dwell and to pasture with it among the wolves, and they multiplied into many flocks of lambs.

Translation Notes

89:10 lions … ravens. For the translation of these animal names, see "Species" in Chapter Five (pp. 121–129). Other than identifying some of the species, the most vexing textual problem is the sharp divide between "falcons" (Eth 2) and "eagles" (Eth 1). Two MSS include both birds (2080^{c}

---

[42] See above, p. 76. Newsom appeals to Gen 9:25–27 ("Enoch 83–90," 39 n. 25), while Nickelsburg appeals to Gen 5:32; 6:9; 7:13; 9:18 (*1 Enoch 1*, 376).

and 2436), but the former is a secondary correction. Ordinarily, the uniform testimony of Eth 1 would be the easy text-critical choice, but here scholars have generally deferred to Eth 2 because the "phoenix" (spelled ፎንቃስ ፡ , *fonqāsa*, in most MSS) can plausibly be identified with the eagle (Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 259; Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 163), and the resultant "falcons, kites, phoenixes (= eagles), and ravens" matches the four birds of 90:6, 11, 16. But 2436 has eagles, falcons, phoenixes and ravens (ወአንስርተ ፡ ወአወ·ስተ ፡ ወፍቃንስተ ፡ [sic] ወቋዓት ፡); thus it includes both eagles and falcons, but it omits kites. As I argue in Chapter Five, the eagles and falcons are probably both original (p. 125), while the "phoenixes" are an addition from either the Greek or Ethiopic phase of transmission (pp. 127–128).

89:11 to bite each other and to seize each other. The text is uncertain. Eth has only, "to bite each other," while the combined text of 4Q*205* 2 i 24+4Q*206* 5 ii 11 yields, "to seize each other" (לְמֶדבד אלן לאלן). But the Aramaic fragments have room in the lacuna before למדבד for additional language. If Eth "bite" represents "seize," then the preceding material in the original Aramaic is simply lost, but it is also possible that both verbs were used and that Eth reflects the loss of the whole phrase, "and to seize each other," through homoioteleuton. The latter option is taken here, following Tiller (*A Commentary*, 273) and Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 223).

89:12 the [white] bull-calf which had been sired by [the white bull]. The bracketed words are supplied by Milik to fill the lacunae of the Aramaic fragments (Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 241–242; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 274). The Eth is shorter: "the bull which had been sired by it."

ram of the flock ... lambs. For a table of translation equivalents for sheep in the *An. Apoc*., see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 275. I base my translation of *caprinae* in the *An. Apoc*. on what can be surmised about the Aramaic original rather than directly on the Ethiopic. As with the bovines, the correspondence between the Ethiopic and the Aramaic is not perfectly consistent, but usually, በግዕ ፡ (sheep in the singular) = אמר (lamb), and አባግዕ ፡ (sheep in the plural) = עֵן (flock) or אמרין (lambs).

General Comments

The Patriarchal period in the allegory is remarkable for its brevity. The multiplication of species after the Flood (89:10) corresponds to the "table of nations" (Genesis 10); the story of the tower of Babel (Genesis 11) is omitted; and the Abraham-Isaac-Jacob-Joseph material (Gen 12–50) is covered in just four verses (89:11–14).

The complex issues involved in identifying and translating the animal species have been dealt with in Chapter Five. As noted in Chapter Two (pp. 63–64), the mixture of hostile and harmless animals points to the moral complexity involved in evaluating the Gentiles. The total of fourteen species may be a borrowing from Zoroastrianism (see pp. 148–149), but it could also be explained as a zoological counterpart to the fourteen species of evergreen trees recognized in both the "Book of the Watchers" (*1En* 3:1) and the "Astronomy Book" (4Q*21l* 1 i 4–6).

Surprisingly, God's covenant with Abraham and Jacob's visionary activity are both left out of the allegory. The *An. Apoc.* does not take advantage of the historical narration to demonstrate the typical Enochic interest in these events. The accounts of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are put to different use.

The *threat of fraternal hostility* is taken up again and given four-fold emphasis. Abraham appears as a white bull born in the midst of many other animals (89:10), but prior to this the reader is told *twice*, in the form of a literary couplet, that these wild animals originate with the sons of Noah:

> They [Noah's sons] began to engender the beasts of the fields, and the birds,
> And from them it came about that there was every kind of species.

These animals are the offspring of Noah's children no less than Abraham, but they are violent and dangerous (89:11a), and since Abraham is born "in the midst of them,"[43] it is implied that they pose a threat. Next, the wild donkey Ishmael is born, then Isaac, and then the reader is told that "the wild donkeys multiplied" (89:11b). The pattern then repeats. The wild boar Esau is born, then Jacob, and the reader is then told that "the wild boar sired numerous wild boars" (89:12a). All three Patriarchs are portrayed as being in a vulnerable position among growing numbers of wild siblings and their potentially dangerous offspring. Jacob strikes back, as it were, by producing twelve young of his own, and they grow to maturity (89:12b–13a), but this counterpunch is neutralized when literally the next statement is that eleven of them turn on their remaining brother and give him into the hands of the wild donkeys, who give him in turn to the wolves (89:13; cf. Genesis 37). Fraternal hostility, potential or actualized, ties together the accounts of all four Patriarchs. Again, the prominence of this motif may reflect friction in the author's day between the followers of Judas and the majority of their fellow Jews.

---

[43] Eth: ማእከለ፡ሙ፡ ; 4Q*206* 5 ii 10:]למצֶ֫[יעהון.

After the extremely spare account of the first three Patriarchs, the relatively detailed story of Joseph's betrayal is unexpected. In fact, it marks a turning point in the allegory. First of all, the story of Joseph's betrayal acts as a check against false interpretations of the three briefer accounts that precede it. With the chosen line of white cattle and sheep potentially in danger from a host of wild animals (Abraham), from donkeys (Isaac), and from black boars (Jacob), it would be easy to evaluate the threat in terms of Gentile hostility to Jews. But Joseph's betrayal either subverts this interpretation entirely (the scandal is *not* Jew-vs.-Gentile but brother-vs.-brother), or it stands as a rebuke to the Israelites, who are no better than their Gentile enemies in their treatment of each other.

Secondly, the story of Joseph's betrayal marks the beginning of a new moral economy in the allegory.[44] With the loss of the last remnants of unified humanity (cattle) and the transition to nationalism (sheep and other animals), history moves into an era governed by moral dynamics other than simple determinism. Color symbolism still functions implicitly as an indicator of the line of promise (sheep are white), but as a marker between the righteous and the wicked, color has been abandoned. Cain's hostility toward Abel can only be explained by his blackness, his natal criminality, but no such explanation holds for Joseph's brothers. Presumably, they are as white as he. Neither are the white corrupted from the outside by the black, as was the case with the Sethites. Now, the white animals do it on their own. Other explanations for good and bad conduct among humans will have to be found.

Thirdly, the Joseph story bars the way against carelessly substituting *species* for *color*, as if species were merely a freshly-minted symbol of predestination in the postdiluvian world. By presenting the Joseph betrayal as the very first story involving the sheep, the point is made from the beginning that sheep *qua* sheep are not necessarily righteous. As for the Gentiles, the ground is already being prepared for recognizing distinctions among non-sheep as well, since animals that are utterly harmless are listed along with dangerous predators (89:10), as pointed out in Chapter Two (pp. 63–64). That these differences actually matter, however, is only an open possibility at this point, whereas the story of Joseph's betrayal is unambiguous as it

[44] Philo of Alexandria also notices that a different moral economy begins with the sons of Jacob, but Philo highlights the positive aspects of it. Previously, there was discrimination against degenerate family members like Cain, Ishmael and Esau, but in the case of Jacob's sons the blessings of God fall on the family *as family*, without such individual discrimination (*Praem.* 57–78).

shows sheep acting as treacherously as the wild animals presumably would. In short, readers are being prepared already for a division between the righteous and the wicked at the final judgment that ignores the accident of species.

Explanatory Comments

89:10 And among these there was born a white bull. The text does not explicitly attest to an unbroken line of white cattle from Shem to Abraham, so it is possible to imagine a lapse and a resumption. However, it is just as easy to read the text as depicting the appearance of the white bull simultaneously with the fourteen species of wild animals, all of them springing from the cattle who emerged from the Ark.

89:11–12 white bull-calf … white ram of the flock. For the significance of the decline from white cattle to sheep (Isaac to Jacob), see the discussion in Chapter One (pp. 52–54). After Jacob, color symbolism is suspended until the reform movement in the author's own day (90:6).

The Qumran fragments allow much more precision in identifying the sort of animals Isaac and Jacob are. Isaac is not simply a "bull" (Eth) but a "bull-calf" (4Q*206* 5 ii 12). Jacob is not simply a "white sheep" (Eth) but a "white ram of the flock" (4Q*205* 2 i 26; 4Q*206* 5 ii 12–13). These details tend to reinforce the larger themes we have detected in the allegory. As mentioned in Chapter Two (p. 31 n. 46), Isaac is diminished, leaving Abraham as the last full-grown white bull, with the result that the eschatological white bull bears a stronger resemblance to Abraham than to Isaac.[45] As for Jacob, his role is enriched, since "ram of the flock" is found elsewhere in the Aramaic fragments as a description of Saul (4Q*205* 2 iii 29). A comparison of the Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic versions of 89:44 suggests that an original "ram of the flock" may also stand behind the "rams" of 89:45–49.[46] Jacob and the three kings of the united monarchy (who are the *only* kings mentioned in the historical survey) are the only "rams" in the *An. Apoc*.[47] If "ram" means "king," then its application to Jacob is a clue pointing to the future: the eschatological white bull is plainly a sovereign ruler in Jerusalem (90:37). The foreshadowing terminology vindicates somewhat the instincts of those scholars who interpret the white bull as a royal figure, even if he is not, as many of them claim, a Davidide.

---

[45] In a similar vein, *Jub* 19:15–31 belittles Isaac in order to bring Jacob closer to Abraham.

[46] For comparison of the texts, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 303–304.

[47] Some of the followers of Judas Maccabee are also rams (90:10–16), but a different word is used.

89:14 Then the ram led forth all of the eleven lambs to dwell and to pasture with it among the wolves, and they multiplied into many flocks of lambs. Jacob exercises a positive leadership role, resulting in the survival and multiplication of the sheep. Since the move to Egypt has dire consequences down the road, several Jewish historical reviews are quick to cite the famine of Gen 41:56–57 in order to justify the move (Ps 105:16; Jdt 5:10; Acts 7:11). The *An. Apoc.* stands within this tradition, as the sheep go to the land of the wolves "to dwell *and to pasture*."[48]

89:15–27: Moses and the Exodus

89 15. Then the wolves began *to fear them and* to harass the flock, going so far as destroying their children: they cast their young into a river of much water. And those lambs began to cry aloud because of their young, making complaint to their Lord. 16. And a lamb which had escaped from the wolves fled, and he went to the wild donkeys. I watched while the flock moaned and cried, *beseeching the Lord with all their strength*, until the Lord of the flock came down from a lofty abode at the voice of the flock, and he drew near and saw them. 17. And he called to that lamb which had escaped the wolves and spoke with it about those wolves, that it should warn them not to touch the flock. 18. So the lamb went to the wolves, as the Lord had commanded, and a second lamb met up with it and accompanied it, and together the two went and entered the council of the wolves. And they spoke to them and admonished them that from then on they must not touch that flock. 19. But after this I saw the wolves, and how they acted with great harshness toward the flock, and with all the vigor they had. And the flock cried out. 20. Then their Lord came to the flock and began to beat those wolves, and the wolves started to moan. But the flock was quiet, and from then on they cried no more. 21. I watched that flock until they departed from the wolves. And the eyes of the wolves were blinded, but the wolves went out, pursuing the flock with all their forces. 22. And the Lord of the flock went with them, leading them, and all of his flock followed him. And his face was glorious and magnificent and terrible to behold. 23. But the wolves began to pursue the flock, until they met up with them beside a certain body of water. 24. And that body of water divided, and the water stood on the one side and on the other before their faces. And as their Lord led them, he placed himself

[48] The famine allusion is noted by Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 25).

between them and the wolves. 25. But the wolves still could not see him, and the flock went out into the middle of that body of water. But the wolves chased the sheep, and those wolves went after them into that body of water. 26. But when they did see the Lord of the flock, they turned back, fleeing from before his face. But the body of water gathered itself together—swiftly resuming its natural state—and the water swelled and rose until it covered over the wolves. 27. And I watched until all of the wolves that were pursuing the flock perished and sank, and the waters covered them over.

Translation Notes

89:15–16 Again, a few phrases in the Eth (*italicized*), are missing from 4Q*206* but could belong to a second edition of the *An. Apoc*.

89:16 Lord of the flock. The first use of this, the usual name for God in the allegory. The original is preserved in 4Q*204* 4 4: מרא ענא. "Lord of the *flock*" is preferable to the more common ET, "Lord of the *sheep*," since ענן refers less to a particular species than to an aggregation of any small, herding animals (i.e., sheep, goats, small cattle).

89:25 And the wolves still could not see him, and the flock went out. Following the reading of Tana. All other MSS say that the wolves could not see *them* (i.e., the sheep), but this makes poor sense. Tana reads literally, "And those wolves still did not see him, and the sheep and they went out …," but Tana has an unusually high number of superfluous "and's" (**ወ**-), and it is frequently necessary to ignore them (Isaac, "1 Enoch," 11–12). "They went out" occurs without a prefixed **ወ**- in one important manuscript: 2080.

into that body of water. Most Eth 1: "to that body of water." 2436 has a unique and peculiar reading: "over that (**ላዕለ ፡ ዝኩ ፡**) body of water."

General Comments

As others have noted, this section of the allegory stays close to the biblical source (Exod 1–15), but that hardly means that the *An. Apoc*. "does little more than summarize Exodus."[49] Choices have been made in selecting and presenting the Exodus material that serve the ideological purposes of the allegory. For example, the oppression in Egypt is characterized in a very specific

[49] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 279, 291 (quote from p. 279). Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 26) and Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 378) also note the unusually close fidelity to the biblical base in this section.

way. The sheep do not complain about their burdensome existence as slaves, as in Exod 3:7, but about the existential threat posed by the destruction of their young (89:15; cf. Exod 1:22),[50] and it is precisely in response to this cry that God finally makes his first appearance in the allegory. As we have seen, the text here is so close to Exodus that the entry point can be precisely identified: *1 En* 89:16b = Exod 2:24–25. Thus, the outcry over the extermination of Israel's children is presented as the thing that prompts God to remember his covenant with Abraham. The fact that this outcry is the only narrative element in 89:15–20 that does not have any biblical basis whatsoever is strong evidence that this motive for the divine debut is assigned quite deliberately.[51] In this way, the allegory appears to be acknowledging that the Abrahamic covenant includes the promise of numerous offspring, along with the all-important promise of universal blessing. A similar acknowledgement can be detected in *1 En* 67:3, part of a Noah apocalypse embedded in the "Parables." As pointed out earlier (p. 34), Noah is promised abundant descendants in language that echoes the Abrahamic covenant.

Examples of significant omission can be seen in the account of the divine commissioning of Moses, his negotiations with Pharaoh, and the plagues. Exodus 3:1–12:36 is summarized in four verses (89:17–20). Moses is told to warn the Egyptians not to harm the Israelites, he and Aaron do so in an address to their council, the Egyptians ignore the warning and treat the Israelites harshly, the Israelites complain, and the Lord comes down and smites the Egyptians (beats the wolves) until they cry out. In keeping with the postdiluvian trend toward depicting moral behavior as something taking place within the world of human decision and action, all traces of predestination in the biblical narrative have been left out. There is nothing of God's continuous advance disclosures to Moses about what he is about to do, and there is nothing reflecting the repeated insistence that God hardened Pharaoh's heart (Exod 4:21; 7:3; 9:12; 10:1, 20, 27; 14:4, 8). In the *An. Apoc.*, the plagues are not an orchestrated demonstration of God's power over Pharaoh and the gods of Egypt (Exod 7:3–5; 10:1–2; 12:12); rather, they are a simple public flogging for disobedience. Obviously, any abbreviation this drastic must leave out much material; nevertheless, what remains is a clear, coherent, and simple moral drama: The wolves are warned. They disregard the warning. They are punished.

---

[50] Reese is justified in highlighting this aspect (*Die Geschichte*, 26).

[51] This does not mean that the outcry over the destruction of their young at this point in the narrative is original to the *An. Apoc.* The same thing happens in *L.A.B.* 9:2, so it could come from a traditional source.

In 89:15–19 the theme of *crying out to God* is prominent. In the allegory, this motif occurs in three significant clusters. Here in 89:15–19 the outcries of the sheep succeed in moving the Lord to descend and help the flock. But in the post-exilic age, during the period when Israel is given over to the governance of 70 wicked angel-shepherds (89:59–90:19), the Lord refuses to respond to protests, whether from the sheep (90:3), from an angel (89:76), or even from Enoch himself (89:57, 69; 90:3). With the expiration of the term of the last angel-shepherd, however, a situation like the exodus has apparently returned, because the outcries of the reforming rams in general and Judas the ram in particular once again persuade the Lord to come down and help the flock (90:11–18). The evident parallelism between the two historical events is one more reason to see typology between the fate of the Egyptians at the Red Sea and the fate of the hostile nations in the coming Last Battle.

Overall, the message seems to be that laments and petitions directed toward heaven are effective in moving God's hand unless he has set a timetable in place that does not allow it, in which case not even a figure as exalted as Enoch can persuade him to intervene. This determinism only applies to epochs of history and its end, however, and not to the moral responsibilities of Israelites, as can be seen in the allegory's apparent disapproval of the failure of the majority of sheep to engage in petitionary prayer (90:11), despite the fact that the sheep would certainly have nothing to point to in the post-exilic age up to that point that would suggest that such prayers have any effect (see 90:3).[52]

The *An. Apoc.* narration of the exodus event itself (89:20–27) has been discussed already (pp. 64–65, 70). Emphasis is placed on the glorious face of the Lord as a visible object of wonder and power (89:22), while the inability of the blinded Egyptians to see him until it is too late, together with the similarities between their fate and the fate of the nations fighting against Israel in the eschatological war, hint at an ultimate standard of judgment for the Gentiles not dissimilar to the one applied to Jews (90:20–27).

[52] Several scholars have noted that the *An. Apoc.* takes a deterministic view with regard to the broad strokes of history and its terminus but not with regard to the details of its unfolding. So Reese, *Die Geschiche*, 49; Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt*, 135; Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux*, 282.

Explanatory Comments

89:16 the Lord of the flock came down. Tiller argues that this statement and "their Lord came to the flock" in verse 20 do not correspond to anything in Exodus and must therefore have special significance.[53] Since the cries to the Lord in the author's day are expected to produce a similar result (90:11, 18), Tiller is probably right that the motif has contemporary significance. However, it is not true that Exodus provides no real parallel. Both of these statements probably reflect Exod 3:8, which specifically mentions God's descent in order to save. For the application of this idea to the present day, the allegorist might also have Psalm 80 in mind, which calls upon God as the "shepherd of Israel" *to come* and to save (vv. 1–2), appealing at one point to the exodus (v. 8).[54]

89:22 And the Lord of the flock went with them, leading them, and all of his flock followed him. And his face was glorious and magnificent and terrible to behold. Again, biblical inspiration may come not only from Exodus but the Psalms: "Yahweh, in the light of your face they shall walk" (Ps 89:15b; see also Pss 4:6; 31:16; 44:3; 67:1; 80:3; 90:8; 119:135). The priestly blessing of Num 6:25–26 also speaks of Yahweh's illuminating face. By invoking this imagery, the allegorist may be speaking the language of his contemporaries. Picking up an image from Deuteronomy (31:17–18), Isaiah (8:16–17; 54:8; 59:2) and Ezekiel (39:23–29), a number of writings claim that the Exile was the time when God *hid his face*, with the result that Israelites wandered and went astray (CD i 3; ii 8; *Jub* 1:13; 4Q*387a* 3 ii–iii; 4Q*389* 1 ii 4–5; 4Q*390* 1 9–10).[55]

---

[53] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 282–283.

[54] Other elements of the psalm reminiscent of the *An. Apoc*. include the invocation of the shining face of God as an image of salvation (vv. 3, 7, 19), and perhaps the reference to God's saving agent as the "son of man" (v. 17), assuming a linkage between Daniel 7's "son of man" and the white bull of *1En* 90:37–38. Also suggestive is the close parallel to Daniel 7's throne-vision in 4Q*530* ii 16–20 (from the "Book of the Giants"), which is prefaced by a divine descent in line 16: נחת לארעא שמיא שלטן ה]א ("Be]hold the Ruler of Heaven descended to the earth"). See Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 219–223.

[55] The *An. Apoc*. is one of several Jewish writings that see the Exile as continuing into the author's own day rather than ending with the rebuilt temple. See Michael Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyJ* 17 (1976), 253–272.

89:28–40: From the Exodus to the Settlement in the Land

89 28. But the flock left those waters and went out into a wilderness, a place without water or grass. And their eyes were opened, and they began to see. And I saw that the Lord of the flock pastured them, and gave them water to drink and grass to eat, and (I saw) the lamb as it was continuing onward and leading them. 29. Then that lamb ascended to the summit of a particular lofty crag, and the Lord of the flock delivered it to them, [while they al]l [st]ood at [a distance]. 30. After that, I saw the Lord of the flock, who stood before the flock, and his appearance was mighty, and great, and terrible. The flock all saw him and were terrified before his face. 31. They were all frightened and trembling before him, and they cried out to that lamb and to that other lamb which was there with them: "We are not able to stand before our Lord, nor to look at him." 32. So that lamb which was leading them went up a second time to the summit of the crag. However, the flock began to go blind and to stray from the path which had been revealed to them. But the lamb was unaware of these events. 33. Then the Lord of the flock was very angry with the flock, and the lamb understood, and it descended from the summit of the crag and came to the flock, and he found that a full majority of them were blind and straying off. 34. When they saw that lamb, they became fearful in its presence, and they wanted to return to their folds. 35. But that lamb took other lambs with it, and it went in among the flock, and they slaughtered every one that had gone astray. So they began to fear his presence. Then that lamb brought back all from the flock which had strayed, and they returned to their folds. [...] that [lamb] labored to reproach and to slay and to trouble (all those) who swore by [...] 36. I watched in the vision until that lamb was transformed and became a man, and he built a house for the Lord of the flock. And he made all of the flock stay in that house. 37. Then I watched until that lamb—which had joined the lamb that led them—fell asleep. Then I watched until all of the full-grown lambs had died, and young ones arose in their places. They entered a pasture and approached a stream of water. 38. Then that lamb which had led them, and which had become a man, separated himself from them and fell asleep. And all the flock searched for him and made quite a loud outcry over him. 39. I watched until they were quiet from crying over that lamb, and they crossed the stream of water. And ⟨two of the⟩ lambs arose, leading them in place of those who had fallen asleep. And they led them, 40. and I watched the flock until they came into a good place, into a pleasant and glorious land. I watched until the flock was satisfied, and that house was in the midst of them in the pleasant land.

Translation Notes

89:28 I saw that the Lord of the flock pastured them. Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 243) restores 4Q*206* 4 iii 17b–18: להון [וחזית עד מרא ענא רעא ...] ("And I saw until the Lord of the flock pastured them ..."). Tiller (*A Commentary*, 288), followed by Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 366), emends the Eth in two places in order to conform it to Milik's reconstruction. But if we restore: להון [וחזית די מרא ענא רעא ...] ("And I saw *that* the Lord of the flock pastured them ..."), no emendations are needed.

89:29 delivered it to them. The ambiguity of the "it" is reflected in the manuscripts. Most Eth 2 (plus *t*) attach a masculine singular object suffix to "delivered" ("it" = the sheep; i.e., the Lord sent Moses back to the flock). Most Eth 1 use a feminine singular suffix ("it" = the Law, **ኦሪት ፡** ; i.e., the Lord gave the Torah to the flock). Four Eth 2 use a masculine plural ("them" = perhaps the tablets, **ጸላት ፡**).

[while they al]l [st]ood at [a distance]. This translates Milik's restoration of 4Q*206* 4 iii 20 (*Books of Enoch*, 244), which has no Eth counterpart. Milik's reconstruction is inspired by Exod 19:27; 20:18; and 20:21, but the correspondence is not exact. So few letters are preserved that it all must be labeled a guess.

89:31 they cried out to that lamb and to that other lamb which was there with them. I accept Tiller's reading of the complex textual evidence (*A Commentary*, 293–294).

89:35 [...] that [lamb] labored to reproach and to slay and to trouble (all those) who swore by [...]. Again we have fragmentary Aramaic text with nothing in Eth corresponding. I accept Tiller's analysis of the Aramaic (*A Commentary*, 290–291, 295), but I translate only the surviving text, without the lengthy restoration in the lacuna preceding it.

89:36 house. In this first reference to the "house," Eth **ቤት ፡** (*bēt*) = 4Q*204* 4 10 [...]מ. Milik restores [שכן]מ "Tabernacle" (*Books of Enoch*, 205), but Tiller's restoration, [דוד]מ "dwelling, compartment," is more persuasive (*A Commentary*, 296). The fact that Eth **ቤት ፡** evidently does not represent בית is helpful in interpreting the allegory. See *Explanatory Comments* below.

89:39 And ⟨two of the⟩ lambs arose. With Tiller and Nickelsburg I accept Charles's emendation of "all of them" (**ዝኵሎሙ ፡**) to "two of them" (**ክልኤሆሙ ፡**). Flemming's suggestion (**ካልኣን ፡** "others") is also possible (*pace* Tiller, *A Commentary*, 300): It would be a general reference to the many sheep that took the places of leadership left by Moses and Aaron

(i.e., Joshua, Caleb, Eleazar, and their successors). Without emendation, the Eth is very difficult to construe. (See Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 194–195; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 300; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 366.)

General Comments

This section covers the biblical narrative from Exod 15:22 to the end of Joshua in twelve verses. Tiller and Nickelsburg both comment on the brief treatment of the giving of the Law, and Tiller also remarks the total omission of the wars of conquest in the promised land.[56] I believe Tiller is correct to highlight the complete absence of conflict in the settlement of the land. However severe the condensation, surely a line or two could have been added indicating that the sheep had difficulties in taking the land. Moreover, the omission is difficult to interpret. Was the allegorist uneasy with the morality of the conquest? As argued in Chapter Two (pp. 63–64), the distinguishing mark between Gentiles who eventually attain to salvation and those who are doomed is whether they are hostile to Israel. It is not easy to see how an offensive war of conquest against the inhabitants of the land could square with such a stance. But in that case, why have the attacks of Amalek (Exod 17:8) and of Og and Sihon (Num 21:33) been omitted as well? Or is the *An. Apoc*. ignoring all military conflicts so that the Israelites may be portrayed as harmless and innocent victims of the Gentile aggression that comes later on?

The giving of the Law on Sinai, as presented in the *An. Apoc*., also needs to be evaluated with caution. The absence of any allusion to Exod 20–24 is sufficient demonstration that the *An. Apoc*. does not view the Mosaic covenant as the cornerstone of Israelite identity, but this may simply be part of a general disinterest in *any* of the usual programs or institutions that are commonly held up as keys to salvation. As argued in Chapter One (pp. 31–37), the allegory looks to a fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant that leaves the bulk of history available for purposes other than *Heilsgeschichte*. It is therefore probably a mistake to view the brief notice of the giving of the Law in 89:29 as a calculated snub. In the first place, the Ethiopic text has lost some material from the original Aramaic at this point. For all we know, 89:29 originally provided a description as respectful as its often-cited counterpart in the *Apoc. of Weeks*, which is also quite brief.[57] Secondly, the *An. Apoc*. is

[56] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 291, 298–299; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 379, 381–382.

[57] "And after that, in the fourth week, at its close, visions of the holy and righteous ones

hardly the only review of Israelite history that gives a relatively full account of the wilderness years and goes straight from there to the settlement in the land, with little or no notice given to the Sinai event in between. Psalms 105 and 106 both do the same.

This section features the first and most revealing instances of (1) seeing the glory of God, symbolized by *open eyes* (89:28), and (2) the sin-and-repentance behaviors symbolized by *going astray* and *returning again* (89:32–35). These have been discussed in Chapter Two. The first affirms the importance of direct religious experience, involving both human and divine initiative, while the second affirms the importance of obedience, involving human free will. In its portrayal of human moral character, this portion of the allegory appears to give equal weight to enlightenment and effort.

Running through the entire section is the *importance of strong leadership*. In fact, it could be argued that this is the dominant theme, since it touches almost every part of the narrative. The allegory has already given examples of effective leadership, both negative (86:3, the angel Asael) and positive (89:14, Jacob). Here, Moses is repeatedly designated the *lamb that leads* (89:28, 32, 37, 38), and not without reason. He takes the Levites with him to punish the straying sheep (89:35a), he brings the strays back to the folds (89:35b), and he makes the flock stay within the camp (89:36). In addition, there is a pedagogical quality to the Golden Calf incident. The guilty sheep are afraid and wish to return to their folds at the very sight of Moses (89:34), but Moses and the Levites proceed to mete out harsh punishment to the malefactors anyway, so that the remaining sheep will also learn to fear his presence (89:35).[58] When the deaths of Aaron (89:37a) and Moses (89:38) deprive the flock of its leaders, the allegory is quick to assure its readers that other lambs arose to take their places, "and they led them" (89:39b). The end result of this continuity in strong leadership is happy settlement in the "pleasant land" (89:40; cf. Ps 106:24).

The interaction of the main themes in this section is also instructive. Moses cannot force the sheep to obey against their will but he can intimidate them when necessary. He can punish the sheep for blindness but he plays

---

shall be seen, and a law for all generations, and an enclosure will be made for them" (93:6). Tiller (*A Commentary*, 291) and Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 50) hold this up as a contrast to the *An. Apoc.*, but the uncertainty of the text of 89:29 makes this a precarious exercise.

[58] "Whereas judgment falls on the blind, that very judgment is intended to instill a submissive fear in the other members of the community" (Tite, "Textual and Redactional Aspects," 111).

no part in opening their eyes. In short, good leadership is portrayed as a powerful influence in producing good behavior, but it is not sufficient to guarantee it.

Explanatory Comments

89:31 "We are not able to stand before our Lord, nor to look at him." This is the only example of quoted speech by the animal actors in the allegory. It appears to be a paraphrase of Exod 20:18–19 and Deut 5:23–26, but the *An. Apoc.* speaks of *standing before God* where Exodus and Deuteronomy speak of *hearing the voice of God*. Since the Lord of the flock does not speak anywhere in the scene, the substitution makes sense and probably has little theological significance, since one who *stands before* is in the position of someone who hears, the posture of an attentive servant.

89:32 to stray from the path which had been revealed to them. This is widely recognized as a positive allusion to the Torah, but the "revealing of the path" has not been narrated, unless something is lost in the text of 89:29. Psalm 105 does the same thing. There is no reference to the giving of the Law, yet the psalm ends with Israel inheriting the land "so that they might keep his statutes and observe his laws" (v. 45).

89:36 that lamb was transformed and became a man. As with Noah (89:1, 9), there is nothing in the text about this transformation that would indicate permanence, and something to suggest otherwise. In verse 39, Moses is still called a lamb, and it is said that lambs arise to replace the ones who have fallen asleep (i.e., Aaron and Moses).

he built a house for the Lord of the flock. Tiller argues persuasively that "house" refers not just to the Tabernacle but to the entire desert camp, which was organized by the command of God through Moses just as explicitly as was the Tabernacle (Num 1–2).[59] Later on, starting in 89:50, "house" refers to the city of Jerusalem, while "tower" is used for the Temple.[60]

89:41–50: From the Judges to Solomon

89 41. At times their eyes were open and at other times blinded, until another lamb arose who led them and brought them all back again; and their eyes were opened. 42. Then the dogs began devouring the flock. Also, the foxes

[59] An explicit equation between the desert camp and Jerusalem is found in 4QMMT (4Q*394* 3–7 ii 16–17; 8 iv 9–10).

[60] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 40–45, 296–297, 312–313.

and the wild boars began devouring them, until the Lord of the flock raised up a certain ram from among the sheep, to lead them. 43. This ram began butting this way and that with its horns, hurling itself against the foxes and then against the wild boars, and it destroyed many of the wild boars. And after them it began [to attack] the dogs. 44. And the lamb, whose eyes were open, observed that ram of the flock, until it abandoned its Glory and began to strike the flock and trample it down. So it departed from the way. 45. And the Lord of the flock sent that lamb to another lamb to appoint it as ram ruling over the flock in place of that ram which had abandoned its Glory. 46. It went to it and had a private conversation with it, and then it raised up that ram to be a ruler and leader of the flock. But while all this was going on, the dogs continued to oppress the flock. 47. The first ram pursued the second ram, and it fled from its presence. And I watched that first ram until it fell before the dogs. 48a. And the second ram arose and began leading the flock, 49. and that flock grew and multiplied. And all of those dogs, foxes, and wild boars feared it and fled from it. And that ram struck and killed every beast, and those beasts did not again prevail in the midst of the flock, and neither did they rob them of anything. 48b. And that ram sired many lambs, and then it fell asleep, and a young lamb became ram in its place. It became ruler and leader of the flock. 50. Then that house grew large and spacious, indeed it was built for that flock. A great and lofty tower was erected upon that house for the Lord of the flock. And that house was lower, but the tower was elevated and lofty, and the Lord of the flock stood upon that tower, and they spread before him a full table.

Translation Notes

89:42 to lead them. Supplied from Eth. Greek omits.

89:43 began [to attack] the dogs. A verb has apparently fallen out of the Greek text,[61] which I mostly follow here. The order of enemies is different in the two intact versions: Greek has foxes-boars-dogs; Eth has dogs-foxes-boars. Aramaic evidence here is fragmentary, but where it can be read it seems to support the Greek.

---

[61] Tiller now rejects the emendation suggested to him by John Strugnell (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 308) and believes the verb has simply been lost, as suggested above (Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 212 n. 5).

89:44 that lamb, whose eyes were opened. Eth is singular (one sheep, i.e., Samuel), but the plural of the Greek suggests that there were many open-eyed sheep. As Samuel is very prominent in this section, Eth is more convincing in this case.

89:44–45 abandoned its Glory … had abandoned its Glory. The Eth is the *lectio difficilior* here, against Greek "abandoned its **way** … had abandoned its **way**" (ἀφῆκεν/ἀφέντος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ). Eth **ሐደገ ፡ ስብሐት/ቲሁ ፡** presupposes ἀφῆκεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. Transcriptionally, either ὁδὸν or δόξαν could be a corruption of the other, but scholars point to a similar opposition at the end of verse 44, where Greek "pathless" (ἀνοδίᾳ) opposes Eth **እንበለ ፡ ተድላ ፡** "without dignity" (= ἀδοξίᾳ?). In this case there is Aramaic evidence, and since it appears to support the terminology of the Greek version ("…]in a path"; 4Q*205* 2 iii 30 בארח[), Tiller rules in favor of the Greek at all three points in verses 44–45 (*A Commentary*, 309–310), as do most critics. But the two textual problems should not be confused. The influence of ἀνοδίᾳ in 44b could be the very thing that led an inattentive copyist to write ὁδὸν instead of δόξαν in verses 44a and 45.[62] Greatly favoring the originality of "Glory" is its correspondence to the language of the biblical narrative behind this episode. See below, *Explanatory Comments* on 89:44.

89:48–49 The Greek preserves the correct order against the confused Eth. (After verse 49 there is only the Ethiopic for the remainder of the *An. Apoc.*) 2436 has some unique readings that evidence scribal efforts to smooth out the broken narrative. Instead of 48a "And that second ram rose up and led the young sheep [48b] and that ram sired many sheep," 2436 reads, "And the second *became* the ram. He rose up and led the sheep, and that *second* ram sired many sheep." Only 2436 omits the adjective "young," in agreement with the Greek (see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 304).

89:50 Then that house grew large and spacious, indeed it was built for that flock. A great and lofty tower was erected upon that house for the Lord of the flock. The text is difficult. The basic issue in evaluating the evidence is whether longer texts reflect dittography or the shorter texts reflect haplography. See the discussion in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 312–313; and Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 369–370. With most editors, I follow here the shorter version, supported by MSS *g, q, u*, 6281, and most Eth 2. For the longer version, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 305.

---

[62] The Greek MS is an 11th c. CE tachygraph, so there would be ample opportunities for copyist errors in the lengthy transmission history behind it.

General Comments

The period of the judges and the united monarchy is dominated by the story of three men, Samuel, Saul, and David. Saul is the main character, being onstage for almost half of the narrative. Although his story overlaps the accounts of Samuel and David, as in 1 Samuel, neither of them is given as much space as Saul. As for the remainder, very little space is devoted to the period of the judges at the beginning of the section or to Solomon at the end. The book of Judges is summarized in a single line (89:41a "At times their eyes were open and at other times blinded"), and Solomon is dealt with almost as tersely (89:48b "a young lamb became ram in its [David's] place. It became ruler and leader of the flock"). Solomon is not connected with the subsequent growth of Jerusalem (the "house") or the erection of the Temple (the "tower"), which are both depicted with passive verbs (89:50).

As Nickelsburg points out, this is the only period in Israel's history that is not characterized by national apostasy.[63] As noted earlier (p. 95), credit for the hard-won peace and prosperity of the flock goes mainly to David (89:49), but credit for the spiritual stability of the sheep during this period goes to Samuel's efforts at the beginning. The allegory uses a cluster of favorite motifs to describe how Samuel's *good leadership* brought the straying Israelites *back to the way of obedience*, and they *found enlightenment*. In the language of the allegory: "At times their eyes were open and at other times blinded, until another lamb arose who led them and brought them all back again; and their eyes were opened" (89:41). It would appear that the reform at Mizpah (89:41b = 1 Sam 7:3–6) had lasting results, and the section ends on a very positive note, with the presence of the Lord among his people in the properly functioning Temple of Jerusalem (89:50).

Unlike Samuel and the general population, the kings get mixed reviews. Saul's military heroics are not minimized, but his failures are reported in remarkable detail.[64] David's military successes provide a secure environment in which the flock can flourish, but beyond this, the only other comment about his rule is, "that ram sired many lambs" (89:48b). This detail serves no narrative function, and it calls to mind nothing positive from the biblical account. Instead, it may well remind the reader of things like David's womanizing and his failure to provide for a smooth transfer of power. As

[63] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 383.

[64] For the correspondences between the allegory and 1 Samuel, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 302–308.

for Solomon, he is called "ruler and leader," but he gets no credit for anything. The allegorist does not damn the monarchy, but as argued in Chapter One (pp. 26–27), neither does he idealize it. No kings are mentioned after this.

The allegorist uses history to accomplish two tasks simultaneously in this section, one negative and one positive. The negative task is to show that the Davidic throne is not the proper center of Jewish identity and hope. If the previous section deflates Mosaic covenantalism by ignoring Exod 20–24, then the present section does the same thing for royalism by highlighting Saul's failures, by picturing David as the enabler but not the author of Israel's finest hour, and by dissociating Solomon from the Temple and its cult. The positive task is to show that the moral dramas of sight/blindness and straying/ returning apply to *individuals* as well as to groups. Unlike Mosaic covenantalism, which focuses on an *event*, royalism focuses on a *person* (the Davidide), and so the two tasks coincide neatly.

As discussed in Chapter Two (p. 79), the opening verse puts the eye-opening *after* the repentance. Enlightenment can follow from obedience as well as enable it. Enter Saul, arising in this time of clear-sighted sheep. Presumably he begins as one of them, but after a good start he "abandons his Glory" and turns against the flock, and so "departs from the way." Since opening the eyes means seeing the *glory* of Yahweh, this amounts to saying that Saul became blind and showed by his destructive behavior that he had consequently gone astray.[65] Without continuance in beholding the glory of God, an individual, even in the midst of others who retain their vision, may fall away. An altogether new lesson drawn from this history is that *enlightenment includes discriminating discernment* with regard to others, since Samuel, "whose eyes were open," can see what is happening to Saul and is able to react appropriately (89:44–46).[66]

The allegory's high regard for good leadership is much in evidence in this section as well. All four principals (Samuel, Saul, David, Solomon) are said

[65] The narrative begs the question what *seeing the glory of Yahweh* could refer to during the time of Samuel. There is no longer a pillar of cloud to provide such epiphanies, and there is no temple yet, described as the tower upon which the Lord of the flock stands (89:50). Possibly the Ark of the Covenant is understood as the point of divine contact. It is the seat of the "Glory" (1Sam 5:21–22) and its presence at the Mizpah assembly, where the flock opens their eyes, could be inferred from the context (1Sam 6:21–7:2) and from Samuel's action of pouring out there an offering of water "before Yahweh" (1Sam 7:6).

[66] If the Greek text is preferred over the Ethiopic, clear-eyed sheep in general are able to see what is happening to Saul. The lesson is essentially the same.

to lead or are called leaders,[67] and all but Solomon (for whom it is empty flattery) earn the designation. Samuel is a very busy sheep in 89:41, 44–46, and Saul's and David's military prowess are fully acknowledged (vv. 43, 47, 49). As pointed out in Chapter Three (pp. 94–95), the leadership theme is proving quite useful for the Enochic allegorist as a diplomatic tool. Just as the portrait of Moses as a praiseworthy leader cushions the blow for Jewish readers who are more inclined than the Enochians to focus on the Sinai covenant, so too in this section the appreciative portraits of the heroic early kings show a certain tact in dealing with readers who have royalist inclinations.

Explanatory Comments

89:41 another lamb arose who led them and brought them all back again; and their eyes were opened. The allegory's high regard for the Mizpah reform (1Sam 7:3–6) may reflect contemporary events. Mizpah is portrayed in the Hebrew scriptures as a place of prayer and worship (Judg 20–21; 1Samuel 7; 10:17–27) as well as a military and political center (1Kgs 15:22 // 1Chr 16:6; 2Kgs 25:23, 25), and these associations still clung to Mizpah in the Maccabean era. Samuel's prayers with repentant Israel at Mizpah led to their first great victory over the Philistines (1Sam 7:6–14), and this served as a model for Judas Maccabee, if we are to credit 1Macc 3:44–47. Judas and his followers assembled at Mizpah, "because Israel formerly had a place of prayer in Mizpah" (1Macc 3:46), and there they fasted and prayed before engaging in battle with the massed forces of the Syrian armies, which included forces from the "land of the Philistines" (1Macc 3:41).[68]

89:42 a certain ram As previously noted, the only sheep designated as "rams" are Jacob and the three kings of the united monarchy. Commentators have not found the term easy to interpret. The use of "ram" for Jacob and Solomon excludes a strictly military interpretation. Tiller argues that "ram" indicates "political leadership,"[69] but if so, it is difficult to see how Jacob would qualify and why Moses would not. More likely, "ram" simply designates a royal character. Its application to Jacob would then be a hint about his true identity, as suggested earlier (see *Explanatory Comments* on 89:11–12, p. 167).

---

[67] *leaders*: Samuel: v. 41; Saul: v. 42b; David: v. 46a; Solomon: v. 48b. David and Solomon are also designated *rulers* (David: vv. 45, 46; Solomon: v. 48b).

[68] Reese, *Die Geschichte*, 30 n. 84; James Muilenberg, "Mizpah," *IDB* 3: 407–408; Goldstein, *1Maccabees*, 261.

[69] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 306. Similarly, for Nickelsburg, "the ram depicts leadership" (*1Enoch 1*, 383).

89:44 it abandoned its Glory and began to strike the flock and trample it down. So it departed from the way. The two phrases, "abandoned its Glory" and "departed from the way" may reflect the language of 1Samuel 15. When Saul protests the loss of his crown, Samuel tells him that the decision is firm, since "the Glory of Israel" does not change his mind (1Sam 15:29). And according to an idiom used in verses 18 and 20, to obey divine instruction is to go (הלך) along the path (דרך) down which one has been sent by God.[70]

89:51–58: The Period of the Divided Kingdom

89 51. Once again I observed the flock, and again they strayed off and followed diverse paths, and abandoned that house of theirs. And the Lord of the flock called some from among the flock and sent them after that flock, but the flock began killing them. 52. One of them, however, escaped and was not killed. It sprang away, and it cried aloud against the flock. And they wanted to kill it, but the Lord of the flock rescued it from the flock, brought it up to me, and set it down. 53. Then he sent many other lambs to that flock to testify against them and lament over them. 54. And after that, I saw that they abandoned the house of the Lord of the flock and his tower. They went utterly astray, and their eyes became blinded. And I saw how the Lord of the flock effected a great deal of slaughter against them in their pastures, until the flock invited that slaughter and betrayed his place. 55. And he abandoned them into the hands of the lions, leopards, wolves, and hyenas, and into the hands of the foxes, and to all the beasts. And those wild beasts proceeded to tear the flock to pieces. 56. I saw too that he abandoned their house and their tower, and he gave all of them into the hands of the lions to tear and devour them—into the hands of all the beasts. 57. Then I began to cry aloud with all my might, and to appeal to the Lord of the flock, representing to him how the flock was being devoured by the wild beasts. 58. But he remained silent while he watched, and he was quite happy that they were devoured, swallowed up, and carried off, and he left them in the hands of all the beasts as food.

---

[70] *Tg. Onq*. 1Sam 15:18, 20 use באורחא for בדרך, matching בארח in *1En* 89:44 (4Q*20*5 2 iii 30).

Translation Notes

89:54 until the flock invited that slaughter. Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 370) emends "until" (እስከ ፡) to "because" (እስመ ፡), but since the historical reference is not absolutely certain, it seems unwise to alter the text.

General Comments

The period of the divided kingdom, from Rehoboam to Jehoiachin, is covered in eight verses. These verses have proven difficult to interpret, mainly because the north/ south geographical focus of the narrative is hard to track. The allegory does not accept the split between Judah and Israel. As Charles puts it, the *An. Apoc*. "treats the Twelve Tribes in their solidarity."[71] The flock is always an undifferentiated "they" or "the sheep." The sins of the north or of the south are simply sins of the flock in general, and the punishment of the Babylonian conquest is something that falls upon all of Israel. This is probably why the Assyrian conquest is virtually ignored: it is not regarded as a parallel event, a northern counterpart to the southern Babylonian conquest; rather, it is an incident in the history of the whole flock that may be noted or ignored, depending on its perceived importance within the collective story.[72]

This is not to say that the allegory treats north and south equally. The apostasy of the north is defined *precisely and entirely* as their departure from Jerusalem (89:51a). On the other hand, the south is equally guilty of "abandoning" the holy city and its temple, an expression that can only be interpreted in a religious sense (89:54a). The *An. Apoc*. is not like Chronicles, which ignores the north and puts all its focus on the south because Judah *is* God's holy nation of promise, from which the others departed into oblivion. In the *An. Apoc*., God is still so interested in the north that he personally sends a string of prophets to them; in fact, in the *An. Apoc*. the *entire* force of prophetic denunciations and lamentations appears to be directed toward them (89:51b–53).[73]

[71] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 199.

[72] The evidence for this is the mere listing of "leopards" in the roll call of enemies in 89:55. The Assyrians and the Egyptians (wolves) are simply two of the nations that afflicted Israel before Babylon and her allies came along. See the discussion in Chapter Five (pp. 131–135).

[73] The only possible exception is the lamenting prophetic voice of verse 53, which could be an allusion to Jeremiah.

Although the story of the flock is one story only, the simplest way to read the structure of this section of this allegory is to divide it into two parts, with the apostasy of the north the subject of verses 51–53, and the apostasy of the south the subject of verses 54–58.[74] There are few interpretive difficulties until the middle of verse 54: "I saw how the Lord of the flock effected a great deal of slaughter against them in their pastures."[75] This probably refers to the frequent wars waged against Judah by various neighbors, interpreted here as divine chastisement, just as they often are in the biblical narrative. Verse 54 ends: "until the flock invited that slaughter and betrayed his place." According to most scholars, this refers to the occasion described in 2 Kgs 16:7–8, a critical moment in the Syro-Ephraimite War (735–732 BCE).[76] King Ahaz makes an ill-advised appeal to Tiglath-pilesar to save Judah from Syria and Israel ("invited that slaughter"), bribing him with treasures looted from the temple ("betrayed his place"). After Ahaz, the allegory's attention moves immediately to the Babylonian incursion (89:55), and the focus remains there to the end of the section, picking up again after the interval (vv. 55–58, 65–66).[77]

The book of Isaiah may shed light on the allegory's priorities in verses 54–58. The dramatic moment when Ahaz was tempted to turn to Assyria was

---

[74] Tiller leans toward this interpretation (*A Commentary*, 317).

[75] Or, "I saw how the Lord of the flock waged a great deal of war against them in their pastures." In the Ethiopic OT, **ገብረ ፡ ቀትለ ፡** means, "to wage war" (1 Chr 10:1; 2 Chr 13:2; Isa 14:21; 42:25).

[76] So Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 216; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 199; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 270; and Ego, "Vergangenheit," 180. Breaking with the consensus, Tiller (*A Commentary*, 318–319) is inclined to push 89:54b back to the time of Asa (1 Kgs 15:16–18). He argues that "the flock invited that slaughter and betrayed his place" refers to looting the temple for funds with which to hire foreigners to attack the northern kingdom. Temple looting occurs three times in the OT (1 Kgs 15:18; 2 Kgs 12:17–18; 2 Kgs 16:7–8), but Tiller claims that only the first of these includes the required fratricidal motive. This is simply mistaken: Ahaz explicitly asks Assyria to intervene *against Israel* (2 Kgs 16:7). Tiller's early dating also leaves insufficient time for the abundant slaughter God visits upon the flocks beforehand. Also breaking with the usual view is Nickelsburg, who moves all of 89:54 forward to the reign of Manasseh (2 Kings 21), because he is certain that this verse describes the famous apostasy of that time (*1 Enoch 1*, 355–356, 384–385). But Nickelsburg's attempt to interpret "they abandoned the house of the Lord of the flock and his tower" as a reference to Manasseh's cultic sins (ibid., 385) is strained, and even if this is granted, the text still needs to be emended (see above, *Translation Notes* on 89:54). The traditional view is that *1 En* 89:54 reflects 2 Kgs 16:7–8, and this continues to provide the best sense.

[77] Nebuchadnezzar's three successful forays into Judah are individually narrated: 89:55 = 2 Kgs 24:1–2; 89:56 = 2 Kgs 24:10–13; and 89:65–66 = 2 Kings 25. The third one, which results in the destruction of the city and the temple, is postponed until after an intermission that describes God's commissioning of 70 shepherd-angels to rule over the sheep (89:59–64). See pp. 131–135 for the identification of the events depicted in 89:55–58, 65–66.

captured and immortalized by the prophet Isaiah (Isaiah 7). Isaiah lived under the shadow of the Assyrians, but according to the book that bears his name, he looked past them and declared that God had *already* given Judah into the hands of the Babylonians (Isa 47:5–6), as pointed out earlier (p. 135). Therefore, the book of Isaiah gives the allegorist warrant for concluding that between Ahaz and Nebuchadnezzar there is nothing of lasting consequence to report.

The lessons of history continue to elucidate principles of morality and responsibility. The allegory points out that the ministries of the prophets, with Elijah at the head, come to nothing (vv. 51b–53). After several instances of strong leadership achieving excellent results, often by prophetic figures (Moses, Samuel), the allegory now shatters any delusions that godly leadership is enough to bend a stubborn population. For the first time in the allegory, the flock strays off and is *not* brought back. Once, Moses used lethal disciplinary force against the flock (89:35); now, the flock uses lethal force against the disciplinarian prophets (89:51b–52).

The motifs of *straying* and *sightedness* are again invoked in order to describe and explain events. Enoch sees that the flock in its northern representation "strayed off and followed diverse paths." He later sees that the flock in its southern representation "went utterly astray, and their eyes became blinded." The straying in each case is given stronger emphasis than usual ("strayed off *and followed diverse paths*," "went *utterly* astray"), and the descent into blindness—the loss of enlightenment—follows the behavior. A blinded animal can scarcely help going astray, but these sheep go astray before going blind. Everything points to extreme perversity on the part of the sheep. When coupled with the remarks of 89:41, the lesson seems to be that human choice can create the conditions for either gaining or losing the needful divine/human encounter.

The decision to allegorize Ahaz's moment of decision in 2 Kings 16 can be explained in more than one way. Contemporary events may have inspired the author to draw a historical parallel. According to 2 Macc 5:15–16, 24–26, the villainous Menelaus allowed Antiochus to plunder the temple and to slaughter Jews as they observed the Sabbath.[78] It may also be significant that an implicit element of the Ahaz story is the familiar theme of *fraternal conflict* in the form of civil war. Israel is poised to attack Judah, and Judah seeks to hire an army to attack Israel in return, even at the cost of profaning the Temple. Despite its chronological distance from Nebuchadnezzar, this

[78] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 319.

final example of Judeo-Israeli fratricide is positioned in the allegory as the "last straw" before God abandons them into the hands of their enemies (89:54–55).

A new element emerges in 89:57–58, as Enoch pleads in vain for the sheep when they begin to suffer at the hands of the lions and other beasts. It is possible that these verses were inspired in part by Jer 15:1–4:

1 En 89:57–58	Jer 15:1, 3
57. Then I began to cry aloud with all my might, and to appeal to the Lord of the flock, representing to him how the flock was being devoured by the wild beasts. 58. But he remained silent while he watched, and he was quite happy that they were devoured, swallowed up, and carried off, and he left them in the hands of all the beasts as food.	1. Then Yahweh said to me: though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people: Send them out of my sight, and let them go! … 3. And I will appoint over them four kinds of destroyers, says Yahweh: the sword to kill, the dogs to drag away, and the birds of the air and the wild animals of the earth to devour and destroy.

Besides some similarities in animal imagery, the reference to Moses and Samuel as famous intercessors on behalf of Israel is interesting, considering the conspicuous roles given to these two as successful leaders earlier in the *An. Apoc.*[79] Here, Enoch takes his place beside Moses and Samuel as Israel's intercessor as well, with no better results than Jeremiah tells us Moses or Samuel would have achieved under these same historical circumstances. The lesson to be learned might be: If godly leadership alone is insufficient to overcome human perversity and prevent its destructive consequences, then that insufficiency even includes the power of godly intercession.

Explanatory Comments

89:54 And I saw how the Lord of the flock effected a great deal of slaughter against them in their pastures. Or, "… in their flocks," or "… in their sheepfolds" (**መራዕይ ፡**). The plural could be an allusion to the individual tribes.[80]

---

[79] The reputation of these men as intercessors is well-deserved. *Moses*: Exod 32:11–14, 30–34; Num 14:13–19; *Samuel*: 1 Sam 7:5; 12:17–18. Enoch is conspicuous as an intercessor (for the fallen angels!) in the "Book of the Watchers" (*1 En* 13:4–7; 15:1–2).

[80] So Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 263) and Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 230), but this is largely due to their dependence on a small pool of late Eth 2 MSS, two of which (*c, e*) read, "in each of their pastures."

until the flock invited that slaughter and betrayed his place. It may be noted that if Nickelsburg's emendation from "until" to "because" is accepted,[81] the order of events is changed, and Ahaz's appeal to Tiglath-pileser *precedes* the "great deal of slaughter … in their pastures." This opens up a different possibility for interpreting the latter line. The Assyrian conquest of 722 could be included as part of the "slaughter," and the plural "pastures" could then be taken as a helpful signal to the reader that both Israel and Judah are to be included in this description.

89:55 lions, leopards, wolves, and hyenas, and … foxes. The identifications of these animals are bound up with identifications of the events described, and vice versa. See Chapter Five, which deals with both issues.

[81] Tiller (*A Commentary*, 315 n. 8) notes that in 89:36, 37, MS *m* reads **እስመ ፡** ("because") for **እስከ ፡** ("until").

CHAPTER SEVEN

EXILE TO THE ESCHATON (*1ENOCH* 89:59–90:42) TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

89:59–64: The Seventy Shepherds

89 59. And he summoned seventy shepherds, and he cast off the flock to them, to pasture them, and he told the shepherds and their assistants: "From now on, each one of you will individually tend the flock. Do everything I command you to do. 60. And I will hand them over to you duly numbered, and I will tell you which of them are to be destroyed. Destroy those." Then he handed over the flock to them. 61. Next, he summoned another one, and he said to him: "Be mindful, and watch everything that the shepherds do to this flock, because they will destroy far more of them than I have commanded them to do. 62. Record every excess and the destruction which will be done by the shepherds, how many they destroy according to my command and how many they destroy according to notions out of their own heads. Make a record against each individual shepherd of all the destruction he causes. 63. Then read aloud before me, by number, how many they destroy and how many they hand over to destruction, in order that this might be a witness against them for me, that I may know every deed of the shepherds, and that I might take their measure and see what they do—whether or not they are abiding by the commands I have given them. 64. But do not let them know it, and do not reveal it to them or admonish them. Merely record all the destruction caused by the shepherds, each individually in his time. Then bring all of it up here to me."

Translation Notes

89:63 that I might take their measure Lit. "that I might measure them" (**ከመ ፡ እመጥኖሙ ፡**). This reading, widely adopted since Charles first suggested it as an emendation in 1893, is now attested in EMML 2436. It is also in 2080^{c}, but there it is an emendation by a later editor (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 327–328). Other manuscripts have either **ከመ ፡ እወትኖሙ ፡** ("that I might begin them") or **ከመ ፡ እመጥዎሙ ፡** ("that I might hand them

over"), which make poorer sense. The idiom is biblical: Isa 65:7 "And I will measure their works" (ומדתי פעלתם).

General Comments

The allegory abruptly changes its focus from earthly to heavenly events. God abandons the sheep to the care of 70 "shepherds" (angels),[1] and he commands a heavenly auditor to carefully and secretly monitor the activities of these shepherds, who will certainly treat the flock with excessive harshness. Each of them is allotted one "time" or "hour" (89:59, 65, 68, 72; 90:1). As the narrative unfolds, it will become apparent that these 70 periods are grouped into four segments, using a 12 + 23 + 23 + 12 pattern (89:59, 72; 90:1, 5, 20).[2] Most scholars agree that the four periods correspond, at least roughly, to the Babylonian, Persian, Greek-Ptolemaic, and Greek-Seleucid periods. The 70 periods finish out the historical review of the allegory, ending when God steps in to inaugurate the eschatological age.

In the allegory, the 70 shepherds and their periods of rule serve the needs of theodicy, excusing God from direct responsibility for the excessive sufferings of the exilic and post-exilic age. This is widely recognized. But they also serve an important historiographical purpose, demonstrating that the post-biblical narrative in the *An. Apoc*. is a trustworthy revelation by appealing to correspondences with known historical events. This has not been recognized. See the discussion in Chapter Three (pp. 99–107).

Explanatory Comments

89:59 seventy shepherds The image of unfaithful shepherds over the flock of Israel is common in the prophetic writings, and the allegory's debt to these passages is not disputed (Isa 56:11; Jer 23:1–4; 25:34–36; 50:6; Ezekiel 34; Zech 10:3; 11:4–17).[3] For their identification as angels, however, and their

[1] Today there is little dispute that the shepherds are angels, not humans. For a history of the problem and its resolution, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 51–52. The only scholars known to me who still maintain that the shepherds are human are Stephen B. Reid ("1 Enoch: The Rising Elite of the Apocalyptic Movement," *SBLSP* 22 [1983], 147–155 [154]) and Philip Tite ("Textual and Redactional Aspects," 112), but neither of them offer any substantial arguments for that view.

[2] A 23 + 12 + 23 + 12 pattern should be rejected. See *Translation Notes* on 89:72a (p. 193).

[3] I do not see any need to emphasize one passage above all others as the primary inspiration for the Enochic shepherds. Carol Newsom thinks we have to do with a "systematic exegesis of Jeremiah 25" ("Enoch 83–90," 25), and VanderKam takes a similar view (*Enoch*

enumeration as 70, it seems most likely that the allegorist has taken a *spatial* image, the traditional 70 angel-princes of the nations,[4] and boldly turned it into a *temporal* image.[5] The inspiration to do so may have come from the original source of the 70 time periods: Jeremiah's prophecy of 70 years of exile (Jer 25:11–12). In Jer 25:14 [LXX v. 12], the prophet speaks of *enslavement to the nations* during those 70 years.[6] It is a short step from this to imagining the 70 angel-princes of the nations dominating the people of Israel, each of them ruling for one of the 70 year-weeks. But if the angel-patrons of *all* the 70 nations are wicked, does this contradict (or at least complicate) the expected salvation granted to peaceable Gentiles in the allegory's *denouement*? Not necessarily. The flock of Israel, under the governance of wicked angel-princes, still divides into good and bad sheep, and there is no reason to think Gentiles lack the same moral freedom and accountability. The determinism that can be seen in the 70 time periods and in God's refusal to interfere apparently does not extend to the moral autonomy of any of the human subjects during those time periods.

89:59–60 and he cast off the flock to them, to pasture them … Then he handed over the flock to them. When does this heavenly event take place vis-à-vis events on earth? Nickelsburg makes a convincing case for

---

and the Growth, 164–167). But Stephen Reid calls *1 En* 89:15–67, "Midrash on Ezekiel 34" ("The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse," 199), and Young S. Chae contends that the 70-shepherd section of the *An. Apoc.* is a "midrash on Zechariah 11–13 rather than on Ezekiel 34" (*Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 105). Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 390–391) provides a more balanced overview of the broad scriptural basis for the wicked shepherds.

[4] The "table of nations" in Genesis 10 totals 70, and many texts suggest that each nation has its guardian angel. See Deut 32:8 (*apud* LXX and 4QDeut[j]); Dan 10:13, 20–21; Sir 17:17; *Jub* 15:31. Later Jewish texts combine the two elements explicitly (*Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 7:11 and Deut 32:8; Hebrew *T. Naph.* 8:3–6 [ET in *APOT* 2:363]).

[5] Failure to appreciate this simple but ingenious twist has led many leading scholars to doubt or deny a connection between Enoch's shepherds and the 70 angels of the nations, including Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 200); Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 35 n. 111); Tiller (*A Commentary*, 53–54); Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 391); and Dimant ("[חנוך החבשי פה-צ] ההיסטוריה-פי חזון החיות מחקרי ירושלים מחשבת ישראל," 1, 2 [1982], 18–37 [26 n. 33]). Most scholars, however, affirm the connection. See, e.g., Black, *Book of Enoch*, 270–271; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 165–166; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.187; R.G. Hall, *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (JSPSup 6; JSOT Press, Sheffield, 1991), 64–66; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 178; and Klaus Koch, "The Astral Laws as the Basis of Time, Universal History, and the Eschatological Turn in the Astronomical Book and the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. G. Boccaccini and J.J. Collins; JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 119–137 (131).

[6] The LXX is particularly explicit: δουλεύσουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη (Jer 25:12).

dating it "back in the historical period described in vv 54–58."[7] The act of abandonment described here fits the language of abandonment in verses 55, 56, and 58 (but not 54, *contra* Nickelsburg). To Nickelsburg's argument may be added the puzzling failure of Enoch's protestations in verses 57–58 to draw any reaction from God. In verses 59–64 we learn why this is the case: History has now entered a deterministic phase, during which time God is deaf to such entreaties (see 89:76; 90:3). If this analysis is correct, the commissioning of the 70 shepherd angels coincides with 89:55, which describes Nebuchadnezzar's first attack on Judah in 604 (2 Kgs 24:1–2).

89:65–72a: The First Period: The Babylonian Era

89 65. And I watched until those shepherds pastured, (each) within his appointed time, and they began killing and destroying far more than they had been commanded, and they abandoned the flock into the hands of the lions. 66. And the lions and the leopards devoured and swallowed up the majority of the flock, and the wild boars devoured along with them; and they burned that tower and demolished that house. 67. I was very much grieved because of the tower and because the house of the flock had been demolished. From then on I was unable to see whether that flock was entering that house. 68. And the shepherds and their associates delivered the flock over to all of the wild beasts for them to devour. And each one of them in his season was receiving individually according to number, and according to number each of them individually was handing over to his fellow. It was being written in a book how many of them were being destroyed. 69. And every one of them killed and destroyed far in excess of his command, and I began to weep and lament over the flock. 70. And so in my vision I saw how the one who was writing recorded once per day what was being destroyed by those shepherds. And he carried up, laid out, and displayed the actual and entire book for the Lord of the flock—everything they had done, and all that each of them had done away with, and all that they had given over to destruction. 71. And the book was read in the presence of the Lord of the flock, and he took the book from his hand, read it, sealed it, and put it away, 72a. and from it I saw that the shepherds had been pasturing for twelve hours.

---

[7] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 390. Dillmann (*Das Buch Henoch*, 264), followed by Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 33) takes a somewhat similar view, reading verse 55 as a preview summary of events that actually follow the heavenly scene of verses 59–64.

Translation Notes

89:65 (each) within his appointed time. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 329) emends the text slightly to make the distributive function explicit, but this is implied anyway.

89:68 and according to number each of them individually was handing over to his fellow. It was being written in a book how many of them were being destroyed. I follow Tiller's reading of the complex and corrupt manuscript evidence. For the second clause, only MS *u* provides a fully satisfactory text, with partial support from Tana and 6281. See Tiller, *A Commentary*, 333.

89:70 once per day. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 329), followed by Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 387), emends አሐደ፡ to አሐደ፡ አሐደ፡ in order to introduce a distributive function. He translates: "I saw how that one who was writing, was writing ⟨each⟩ one that was being destroyed by those shepherds every day." Rather than emend the text, I construe አሐደ፡ with በዝኑ፡ ዕለት፡. The syntax is a little unusual but hardly unintelligible. Literally: "I saw that one who was writing, how he was writing once what was being destroyed by those shepherds (in) every day."

laid out. I see no reason to emend the text here, *pace* Tiller (*A Commentary*, 330) and Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 388–389).

89:72a and from this I saw that the shepherds had been pasturing for twelve hours. Enoch has learned the elapsed time *from the book* just read aloud in his hearing. The first word, ወእምኔሁ፡, has been universally translated as a temporal adverb ("and after this," "thereafter," "et après cela," "ensuite," "darnach," "und sofort," etc.), but this is awkward since most scholars are convinced that the twelve hours refer to what has already transpired in verses 65–71 (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 337–338). Nickelsburg solves the problem by emending the text (*1Enoch 1*, 387, 389). I suggest that እምኔሁ፡ is not an adverb here but a translation of "from it" or "from this," precisely as it is in *1En* 32:2, where እምኔሁ፡ = ἀπὸ τούτου (cf. Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 1. 101). For ἀπό as indicating a source of information, see, e.g., Col. 1:7, ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ. In a similar vein, Tiller suggests that እምኔሆሙ፡ in 89:54 may not be a temporal adverb but could represent מינהון "(some) of them" (*A Commentary*, 318).

General Comments

This section completes the description of the Babylonian period, which actually began in 89:55 with the first mention of falling into the hands of the lions. The 587 BCE destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is easily recognized in 89:65–66, but there are few subsequent details about the exile beyond some general comments about the destruction of the flock through the predatory activity of the wild animals. The bulk of this episode, like the bulk of the previous episode, is devoted to a detailed description of the meticulous auditing system. The allegorist appears to be going to extraordinary lengths to reassure readers that not one innocent Jew has slipped through the cracks, that not one crime of the Gentiles against Israel has gone unnoticed. The emphasis on the importance of each individual, implied by the continual insistence on precise enumeration (89:60, 62, 63, 68, 70), may be compared with a general tendency in Jewish literature about the dispersion, a trend towards stories about individuals rather than population blocks (Dan 1–6; Susanna; Bel and the Dragon; Tobit; 1 Esd 3–4). There is also a parallel theological emphasis on the moral accountability of each individual (Ezekiel 18).

Explanatory Comments

89:66 lions ... leopards ... wild boars. This verse provides excellent evidence that the allegorist has drawn from biblical sources beyond 2 Kings (or 2 Chronicles), since he has Assyrians (leopards) and Edomites (wild boars) participating with the Babylonians (lions) in the destruction of Jerusalem. As discussed in Chapter Five (p. 134), the participation of the Assyrians is a valid inference from Ezek 23:23–25, and the participation of the Edomites is abundantly attested outside of 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles.

devoured and swallowed up the majority of the flock. As Tiller notes, devouring and swallowing apparently refer not just to killing but to captivity.[8]

89:67 From then on I was unable to see whether that flock was entering that house. The biblical evidence is contradictory on the question of whether Jerusalem in particular and the land in general were virtually depopulated by the exile.[9] In light of this ambiguity in the biblical record, it

[8] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 331.

[9] Some texts suggest something close to a total depopulation (2 Kgs 24:14; 25:11, 21, 26; Jer 36:29; 2 Chr 36:21; Lam 1:1–4), while others make it clear that many remained behind (Ezek 23:33; Hag 2:2–4; Zech 2:6–13; 6:9–15; 8:2–8). For recent debate on the impact of the

is not surprising that the *An. Apoc.* is noncommittal about Jerusalem's Jewish population during this time.

89:72b–90:1: The Second Period: The Persian Era

89 72b. And behold three of those lambs returned! They arrived, entered, and began to build up all of that house that had fallen down. And the wild boars attempted to prevent them, but they could not. 73. And they began to build again, as before, and they raised up that tower, and it was called "the high tower," and they began again to install a table in front of that tower. But all of the bread upon it was polluted and impure. 74. Regarding all of these things, the eyes of the flock had become blind, so that they could not see, and similarly even their shepherds, and they were handing over their ⟨sheepfolds⟩ to severe destruction, and the flock was trampled underfoot and devoured. 75. But the Lord of the flock remained silent until all of the flock was scattered over the fields and were mingled with them, and from the power of the beasts they were not saved. 76. And he who was recording in the book brought it up, displayed it, and read it at the mansions of the Lord of the flock, and he implored him and petitioned him on behalf of them as he showed him all the deeds of the shepherds, giving testimony against these shepherds in his presence. 77. Then he himself took the book itself and placed it next to him, just so, and departed. **90** 1. And I watched until the time came that thirty-⟨five⟩ shepherds had pastured in this manner, and all of them completed their respective periods just as the first ones had. Then others received them into their hands that they might tend them for their several periods—each shepherd in his own period.

Translation Notes

89:72b three. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 338–339) prefers "two," legible as the reading of 2080.* It has been corrected to "three," the reading of all other manuscripts.

89:74 and they were handing over their ⟨sheepfolds⟩ to severe destruction, and the flock was trampled underfoot and devoured. The text here is not so corrupt as most editors suppose. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 336, 341) translates literally: "And they were handing them over even to

---

Babylonian deportations on Judah, see Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 3–89.

their shepherds for destruction exceedingly, and they trampled the sheep with their feet and devoured them." He also discusses some unconvincing attempts to wring sense from the text, both ancient (MS variants) and modern (Nickelsburg's emendations). But if the second **ኖሎቶሙ ፡** in verse 74 is read as "their sheepfolds" rather than "their shepherds," all problems vanish. "Sheepfolds" then becomes the *direct* object of **መተወ ፡** ("to hand over"), not the indirect object, in which case the **ለ**- prefix is not a preposition but an object marker and is therefore not translated. (See, e.g., v. 68: "they handed over those sheep" **መተወ·ዎሙ ፡ ለእልኩ ፡ አባግዕ ፡**). Also, once the sheep are reintroduced as the object of "handed over," the verbs in the final clause ("they trampled," "they devoured") are readily understood as periphrastic passives, as Isaac translates them ("I Enoch," *OTP* 1. 69). Whether by design or by accident, **ኖሎት ፡** can indeed represent "flocks" or "sheepfolds" as well as "shepherds." In the Ethiopic OT, translated from the LXX, **ኖሎት ፡** usually = ποιμένες (Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 670), but in at least five cases, **ኖሎት ፡** = ποίμνια (Gen 29:3; 1Kgdms 24:4; 1Chr 17:7; Isa 17:2; Mic 4:8). Bowing to this usage, modern Ethiopic lexicons list "sheepfold" alongside "shepherds" under **ኖሎት ፡** .[10]

89:77 just so. (= **ከማሁ ፡**) Only in Tana and (probably) 2080*.

90:1 thirty-⟨five⟩. All manuscripts have "thirty-seven," universally recognized as a scribal error. Since there are 23 shepherds in the third period, bringing the total to 58 (see 90:5), there must be a total of 35 in the first two periods.

General Comments

With the establishment of the Second Temple (89:73), the allegorist has finally exhausted his biblical sources of continuous history, and the thinness of the available resources from that point forward shows itself in the accounts of the Persian and early Hellenistic eras. If the stereotypical language of oppression and the descriptions of the angel-shepherds and

[10] See S. Grébaut, *Supplément au Lexicon linguae aethiopicae de August Dillmann (1865) et édition du lexique de Juste d'Urbin (1850–1855)* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952), 22; and Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 398. But I have doubts about the wisdom of the inclusion. In my opinion, there is no proof that any translator knowingly used **ኖሎት ፡** for "flocks" or "sheepfolds" in the Eth OT. In all five cases where **ኖሎት ፡** = ποίμνια, the LXX MS tradition includes ποιμένες as a variant, and in all five cases reading "shepherds" instead of "flocks" or "sheepfolds" does not create nonsense. Nevertheless, whether deliberate or accidental, this phenomenon shows how easily **ኖሎት ፡** can come to stand for "sheepfolds" in texts translated from Greek, vulnerable as such texts are to ποιμήν / ποίμνη confusion. It should be noted that a similar hazard exists with regard to Palestinian Aramaic: רעי ("shepherd") / רעו ("pasture").

heavenly audits are set to one side, there remain in the allegory very few observations about these periods that qualify as specific historical claims.

The Persian era is depicted as uniformly miserable, characterized by relentless violence against the flock. The bad news starts with the Second Temple, which is declared a failure from the beginning (89:73b), and this is immediately followed by: "*Regarding all of these things* (ዲበ ፡ ኵሉ ፡ ኤሉ ፡), the eyes of the flock had become blind, so that they could not see" (89:74). By placing this remark *after* the negative portrait of the Temple, and by connecting it with an ambiguous preposition (ዲበ ፡ = על), the *An. Apoc.* maintains the studied ambiguity of the blindness-vs.-seeing motif, which resists absolute attribution to either human or divine initiative. So it is in this case: Is the blindness of the flock the *cause* or the *result* of the divine rejection of the Second Temple? The cagey semantics of the allegory will not allow a simple answer.

Information about the Persian era in Judea was slender in antiquity,[11] and it is no surprise that the allegory has little historical detail to report, but 89:74–75 speaks of great oppression against the flock followed by what looks like a forced deportation: "[T]he flock was scattered over the fields, mingling with them; and from the power of the beasts they were not saved" (89:75b). This description has been connected with reports about the deportation of Jews to Hyrcania (and possibly also to Babylonia) by Artaxerxes III Ochus (358–338) during one or another of his Egyptian campaigns.[12] These deportations are usually associated with Ochus's crackdown against the so-called "Tennes Rebellion" (ca. 345–343). The size and scope of this event have generated considerable controversy among historians,[13] but the reports of Jewish deportations are generally accepted as plausible,[14] and therefore it

---

[11] This is still true today, although archaeology has expanded our data base considerably in recent decades. See especially Ephraim Stern, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period, 538–332 B.C.* (Warminster, UK: Aris and Phillips, 1982). For a summary of recent developments in this area, see James D. Purvis and Eric M. Meyers, "Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State," in *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple: Revised and Expanded Edition* (ed. H. Shanks; Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1999), 201–229 (225–227).

[12] This connection was made by Charles Foster Kent, *A History of the Jewish People During the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek Periods* (New York: Scribners, 1904), 232.

[13] The state of the debate is summarized in Lester Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period: Volume 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (LSTS 47; New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 346–349. Grabbe takes a minimalist view with regard to the size and severity of this "rebellion" and possible Jewish involvement in it. For a maximalist view, see D. Barag, "The Effects of the Tennes Rebellion on Palestine," *BASOR* 183 (1966), 6–12.

[14] The evidence for a Jewish deportation to Hyrcania by the Caspian Sea is fairly good,

is not unlikely that there was some degree of provocative Jewish participation in western resistance to Persia during this time period. One difficulty with this otherwise attractive explanation for *1En* 89:75 is that the "Tennes Rebellion" lies outside the timeframe constructed by the allegorist, which requires the year 359 as the divider between the Persian and Greek blocs. Perhaps the allegorist did not know what year the deportations took place. For that matter, no one does. The reported dispersals have also been associated with Ochus's earlier campaign against the so-called "Revolt of the Satraps" (ca. 353–351),[15] and there is even a third possibility, this time within the timeframe, since Ochus led a still earlier attack on Egypt in 360 or 359 as a satrap and commander of his father's army.[16]

Whatever specific events the *An. Apoc.* may be allegorizing when it says the flock was *trampled underfoot* (89:74), the image is not inappropriate to the period. For the Tennes campaign, Ochus took a massive army through Syria en route to Phoenicia.[17] Earlier in the century, huge Persian armies attacked Egypt, probably in 385–384 and again in 374–373, and great numbers of these Persian troops remained in Palestine after withdrawing from Egypt, making ready for a new attack.[18] It must be admitted, however, that virtually any extended period in the post-exilic age can furnish examples of armies tramping through Palestine.

Explanatory Comments

89:72 three lambs It is generally agreed that two of these are Joshua and Zerubbabel. If the allegory follows the traditions of Ezra-Nehemiah, the

---

and even Grabbe, who is skeptical about Jewish involvement in the "Tennes Rebellion," admits that "some Jews may indeed have been settled in Hyrcania by the Persians during the fourth century" (*A History of the Jews*, 348). The evidence is discussed in Noah C. Hirschy, *Artaxerxes III Ochus and His Reign* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1909), 38–42; Barag, "The Effects," 8–9; and Schürer (Vermes), *The History of the Jewish People*, 3. 6 n. 12. For deportation to Babylonia, the evidence is weaker. Hecataeus of Abdera says that a great many Jews were deported to Babylon by the Persians (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1:194). Some have dismissed this as a confusion with the Babylonian captivity (e.g., Thackeray, LCL 186, 241 n. *b*; Grabbe, *A History of the Jews*, 348), but Eusebius (*apud* Syncellus, *Chron.* 1.486.14) claims that Ochus deported Jews to both Hyrcania and Babylonia.

[15] Hirschy, *Artaxerxes III Ochus*, 42; F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts: Revised Edition* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 56.

[16] Very little is known about this campaign. The available evidence is discussed in Pierre Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 665.

[17] Diodorus, *Hist.* 16.44.4.

[18] Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander*, 652–655, 992.

third lamb is probably Nehemiah; but if it follows the traditions of 1 Esdras, the third is probably Sheshbazzar.[19] Two things favor the latter possibility. First, the apparent order of rebuilding, Jerusalem first (89:72) and then the temple (89:73), fits 1 Esd 2:18–20; 4:43–46, 63 but not Ezra-Nehemiah. Second, the *An. Apoc*. indicates Edomite participation in the destruction of 587 and Edomite resistance during the rebuilding of 520 (the wild boars of 89:66, 72). Edomite participation in the 587 debacle is explicit in 1 Esd 4:45, and some sort of Edomite troublemaking after the exile may be implied in 1 Esd 4:50 (a royal command to the Idumeans to relinquish the Jewish properties they seized during the exile). There are no similar traditions about the Edomites in 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, or Ezra-Nehemiah.

If the author of the *An. Apoc*. follows the 1 Esdras traditions, one result is that the dating of the incidents described in 89:72b–73 is simplified, since 1 Esdras utterly ignores Nehemiah and credits Zerubbabel with beginning the construction of both the city and the Temple (1 Esd 4:47, 63), while sharing the 520 BCE starting date common to all surviving traditions (cf. 1 Esd 6:1–2).

89:73 all of the bread upon it was polluted and impure. It is clear that the Second Temple does not meet with the approval of the allegorist, although no reason is given beyond this remark, which echoes Mal 1:7 and 12.[20] According to Nickelsburg, "the author asserts that from its inception the Second Temple did not follow correct laws of ritual purity." For support, Nickelsburg points to similarities between the *An. Apoc*. and the *Damascus Document*.[21] Tiller is less certain. He discusses a range of possible reasons for the allegory's negative verdict but does not think there is enough information to make a choice.[22] As argued earlier (pp. 95–96), the allegorist may have left the reasons ambiguous in order to allow Jews with a variety of complaints

---

[19] As argued by Tiller (*A Commentary*, 338–339); and Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 394). The most complete study is C. Begg, "The Identity of the Three Building Sheep in 1 Enoch 89,72–73," *ETL* 64 (1988), 152–156.

[20] Tiller (*A Commentary*, 340) is virtually alone in his skepticism about the Malachi allusion. He fails to notice that the correspondence goes beyond the word "polluted" (ርኩሱ = ἀκάθαρτος = טמאה). Both texts also describe the altar as a "table" with "bread" upon it.

[21] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 395. In the *Damascus Document*, the temple has been defiled by the priests' flagrant purity infractions (CD iv 17; v 6–8), and members of the community are instructed to abstain from its sacrifices, with Mal 1:10 cited in support (CD vi 11–13).

[22] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 39–40. The main possibilities are *halakhic* disputes, calendrical disputes, and intermarriage scandals. If the language of 89:73 consciously echoes Mal 1:7 and 12 (as most scholars think), one could also look to Malachi 1 and add to the list of possibilities *a contemptuous, irreverent attitude toward sacrifice*, which is not exactly the same thing as *halakhic* error.

about the Second Temple to own the present narrative. Whatever the specific issues are, they invalidate the temple cult permanently. There is no reform or even an attempt at reform in the remainder of the allegory. The sympathies of the allegorist may be with those who saw the Second Temple as irremediably inferior from its birth (Ezra 3:12; Hag 2:3; Zech 4:10; cf. Isa 66:1).

89:74 the eyes of the flock had become blind … and similarly even their shepherds. The singular reference to blindness on the part of the angel-shepherds ties them into the same moral framework as humans. Apparently, beholding the glory of Yahweh is essential for the spiritual health of angels just as it is for humans. The notion that higher angels enjoy an access to the glorious presence of God that lesser angels are denied is found in the "Book of the Watchers" (9:3–4; 14:20–23),[23] but an explicitly moral component to this division does not appear in *1Enoch* until the "Parables," where we are told that the satans are forbidden access (40:7).

89:74–75 their shepherds … were handing over their ⟨sheepfolds⟩ to severe destruction, and the flock was trampled underfoot and devoured … until all of the flock was scattered over the fields and were mingled with them, and from the power of the beasts they were not saved. The phrase "all of the flock" is not necessarily an impediment to identifying this description with the Ochus deportations. The use of "all" as an intensive, meaning only "a great many," is fully demonstrable elsewhere in the allegory.[24] The language here is strong, but evidence that the campaigns of Ochus earned him the status of arch-villain in later Jewish imagination can be seen in the prominent re-use of his generals as bad guys in the mixture of characters and events that make up the historical fiction of Judith.[25]

Whether or not Ochus lies behind this report, the allegorist has presented it in biblical language:

---

[23] A classic expression of this idea is in Tob 12:15: "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels who present the prayers of the holy ones and enter into the presence of the Glory of the Holy One." The Sinaiticus text reads: "I am Raphael, one of the seven angels who stand at attention (παρεστήκασιν) and enter into the presence of the Glory of the Lord."

[24] In 89:35, Moses and the Levites kill "*all* that had gone astray" (4Q*204* 4 7: כול טעיתא) and then immediately return "*all* of the flock that had strayed" to their folds (4Q*204* 4 8: כול ענא טעיתא)!

[25] It has long been observed that Nebuchadnezzar's generals, Holofernes (Jdt 2:4) and Bagoas the eunuch (Jdt 12:11) are the names of two of Ochus's generals (Diodorus, *Hist.* 31.19.2–3; 16.47.4; 17.5.3). There is no need to argue from this that Judith is based on or inspired by Ochus's campaign (as already claimed in the fourth century by Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2:14–16; and among modern scholars, most influentially by Otto Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* [New York: Harper and Row, 1965], 586–587).

> You have given us up as sheep to be eaten; you have scattered us among the nations. (Ps 44:11)
>
> "Woe to the shepherds who are destroying and scattering the sheep of my pasture!" says Yahweh. Therefore thus says the Yahweh, God of Israel, concerning the shepherds who are shepherding my people: "You have scattered my flock and driven them away, and have not attended to them". (Jer 23:1–2a)
>
> And they were scattered for lack of the shepherd, and they became food for every beast of the field and were scattered. (Ezek 34:5)

It seems that the "Persian exile" of *1En* 89:74–75 employs the same imagery used in scripture to describe the Babylonian exile. This may be less significant than appears, however, since the author may have been driven back to reliance on whatever biblical language seems suitable, simply for lack of detailed knowledge about the event.

90:2–5: The Third Period: The Macedonian-Ptolemaic Era

90 2. And after this, I saw in my vision all the birds of the sky coming: eagles, falcons, kites, and ravens; and the eagles were leading all the other birds. And they began to devour the flock, pecking out their eyes and devouring their flesh. 3. And the flock cried aloud, for their flesh was being devoured by the birds. And as for me, I cried aloud and protested in my sleep about that shepherd who tended the flock. 4. And I watched until that flock had been devoured by the dogs and the eagles and the kites, and they left on them not a bit of flesh, or skin, or sinew; until only their bones were left standing. And even their bones fell to the ground. And the flock became few. 5. And I watched until such time as twenty-three shepherds had pastured, and in their several periods they completed fifty-eight periods.

Translation Notes

90:2 falcons All other translators render **አሞ·ስት ፡** as "vultures." For the translation "falcons," see pp. 125–127.

90:3 I cried aloud and protested in my sleep. Five Eth 1 MSS: "I watched and protested in my sleep." 2436 has only "I watched in my sleep."

General Comments

The third period of the 70 shepherds covers the Macedonian and Ptolemaic eras in a mere four verses. The allegory paints militant Hellenism as

qualitatively different than other periods, describing Israel's attackers as birds of prey instead of predatory quadrupeds, and it begins with what appears to be a summary statement. Enoch sees all of the various Greek dynasties coming, as if from a distance (90:2a). The phrase, "and the eagles were leading all the other birds" (90:2b) is understood by most commentators as a reference to Alexander the Great's conquest in 332, which opened the way for all the succeeding Hellenistic kingdoms. It is harder to place the subsequent comments: "And they began to devour the flock, pecking out their eyes and devouring their flesh. And the flock cried aloud, for their flesh was being devoured by the birds" (90:2c–3a). Does the allegory continue to describe here the original Macedonian occupation and its immediate aftermath, or has it returned to summarizing the entire coming experience of "the birds" in general? A very slight clue that the Macedonians are still in view can be detected in Enoch's protest *at the end* of verse three over "that shepherd who tended the flock." There are protests elsewhere about the misconduct of the angel-shepherds (89:69, 76), but only here do we find a complaint about one in particular. If one shepherd out of the 70 were going to be singled out for special censure, the shepherd who allowed aggressive Hellenism to come in with Alexander would not be a surprising choice.

The thrice-noted "devouring" in 90:2–3 could be literal violence (e.g. military atrocities),[26] but more likely it is figurative of enslavement and economic exploitation. This would be in keeping with the "devouring" found in other parts of the allegory, such as 89:42–43, where Saul puts an end to the "devouring" of the flock by the dogs, foxes, and boars. This corresponds to 1Sam 14:48, where Saul delivers Israel "from the hands of their plunderers (מיד שסהו)." As previously noted, in 89:66 "swallowed" and "devoured" include captivity as well as killing. Alexander and his generals left behind garrisons and military colonies,[27] and of course the lands and produce they came to enjoy once belonged to the indigenous population, but we do not have any corroborating evidence for the exploitative picture in 90:2–3 other than Hecataeus of Abdera's vague report that "not a few" Jews emigrated in the years following Alexander's death due to disturbed conditions in

[26] Curtius Rufus (4:8:9) records an episode involving a Samaritan rebellion and a severe reprisal from Alexander, and there is a cave full of bones as possible archaeological confirmation, but no other evidence of this kind of thing has survived. See Schürer (Vermes), *History of the Jewish People*, 2.160–161.

[27] Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 105–111; Schürer (Vermes), *History of the Jewish People*, 1.144.

Syria.[28] If indeed 90:2–3 describes the interlude before Ptolemaic possession of Palestine, these verses should be added to the small store of meager clues for that period.

Verse 90:4 summarizes the entire Ptolemaic century. The victimization of the flock of Israel is described in an unusually graphic and developed metaphor, and the claim is made that their numbers are severely diminished. Tiller is inclined to dismiss this picture as "based on anti-Ptolemaic propaganda since there is little evidence that there really were fewer Jews during this period."[29] In a similar vein, a number of scholars speculate that the third century was a relatively good one for Judeans,[30] But others have argued that the Palestinian archaeological record does not support this picture. According to Robert H. Smith, scholars have failed to take note of the "extreme imbalance" in the data for the Ptolemaic and Seleucid halves of the Hellenistic era, and he concludes that the best explanation for the thin, third-century archaeological record is the economic stagnation and population decline that took place in Palestine and Transjordan under the Ptolemies, partially the result of drought conditions but also due to differences in "attitudes, policies, and practices" between the two Hellenistic kingdoms.[31] Smith cites a number of ancient sources that speak of devastation, harsh treatment, and depopulation around the beginning and the ending of the Ptolemaic century,[32] and he finds nothing in the

---

[28] Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1:194–195.

[29] Tiller, *Commentary*, 348.

[30] "Judaea may have been fairly happy under the Ptolemies" (W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilization* [3d ed; Cleveland: World Publishing, 1952], 212); "a time of relatively peaceful development" (Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:12); "a relatively untroubled existence" (Erich S. Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews," in *Hellenistic History and Culture* [ed. Peter Green; Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley: University of California, 1993], 238–274 [238]). Tcherikover goes so far as to argue that the Jewish population swelled under the Ptolemies (*Hellenistic Civilization*, 119–120), but his case is based entirely on scattered comments made by Hecataeus of Abdera (*apud* Diodorus, *Hist*. 40:3:8; and *apud* Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1:197–198). Hecataeus writes no later than 300 BCE, and even if his hearsay reports were reliable, they are more reflective of Judean life before Ptolemy than after.

[31] Robert H. Smith, "The Southern Levant in the Hellenistic Period," *Levant* 22 (1990), 123–130 (quotes from pp. 123, 127; drought: pp. 124–125).

[32] Ibid., 123–124. The sources are numerous. For hardship and depopulation between Alexander and Ptolemy: Hecataeus *apud* Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1:194–195. For Ptolemy I's harshness and his mass deportation of Jews: *Let. Aris*. 12–13, 19–23; cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 12:3–7, 25–29; Agatharchides of Cnidus *apud* Josephus, *Ag. Ap*. 1:209–211; Appian, *Syr*. 50; Plutarch, *Dem*. 5:2. For devastation in the final decades of the third century: Josephus, *Ant*. 12:129–130. In one place Hecataeus speaks of Jews who happily accompanied Ptolemy back to Egypt in 311 (Josephus *Ag. Ap*. 1:186–189). The motive Hecataeus assigns is implausible, but if anything about

archaeological record to suggest that the southern Levant bounced back during the period in between.[33] Other, more recent archaeological work indicates that the population of Jerusalem and Judea did not return to pre-exilic numbers until the second century.[34]

In the allegory this decline is blamed, naturally, on the occupying Ptolemies (kites), along with the Macedonians (eagles), who linger on in their military colonies and in the Ptolemaic army.[35] This accounts for the kites and eagles, but what of the dogs? These should be Philistines, according to the allegory's earlier usage. Most decisive is 89:47, where the ram that represents Saul falls before the dogs (cf. 1Sam 31:1–6). A number of scholars find this late mention of an ancient enemy implausible and question the identification,[36] but Philistines are not anachronistic in a second century Jewish writing. Angry references to them appear in Sir 50:25–26 and *Jub* 24:28–33, and 1Maccabees mentions fighting between Judas and forces from "the land of the Philistines" (1Macc 3:41; cf. also 3:24; 4:22; 5:66–68). Furthermore, 1Macc 10:70–11:4 contains a number of hints that people of the coastal plain maintained a self-conscious Philistine ethnic and religious identity well into the Maccabean period.[37] More evidence that at least some Jews during the Hellenistic age lumped Philistines and Greeks together can

---

the report is true, it is another testimony to the desirability of emigration from Judea. Hengel too collects a number of data that all point to "a constant immigration from Palestine" (*Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:41–42).

[33] An exception to Smith's assessment must be made for Samaria. The pertinent data for recent archaeological work at Shechem had not yet been published at the time of Smith's article (as he himself cautions: "The Southern Levant," 124). Shechem was apparently at its lowest ebb during the Persian era but made a substantial demographic and economic recovery late in the fourth century. See Edward F. Campbell, Jr., *Shechem II: Portrait of a Hill Country Vale: The Shechem Regional Survey* (ASOR Archaeological Reports 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 97; and idem, *Shechem III: The Stratigraphy and Architecture of Shechem/Tell Balâṭah: Volume 1: Text* (ASOR Archaeological Reports 6; Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2002), 311. Literary evidence supports this picture, but it also suggests that the earlier economic recovery of Samaria only served to make Judean life more difficult (Josephus, *Ant*. 12:156; and the "Tobiad Romance" in Josephus, *Ant*. 12:168).

[34] Purvis and Meyers, "Exile and Return," 227.

[35] Macedonians figure in the Ptolemaic forces during the wars against Antigonus and Demetrius (Diodorus, *Hist*. 19:93:1; 19:100:4), and there is no reason to think this was discontinued going into the third century.

[36] Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 235–236; Schreiner, *Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik*, 97; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 275; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 99.

[37] For the latter passage, see esp. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 260, 420–421. Discussion in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 347; and Nickelsberg, *1Enoch 1*, 396. For the Philistine armed forces of 1Macc 3:41, see Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 247–248. For Philistine religion and Philistine cities during the Hellenistic age, see Schürer (Vermes) *History of the Jewish People*, 2.29–35, 98–103, 105–110.

be seen in Isa 9:12 [11]. In a unique translation, the Philistines (פלישתים) of the Hebrew text become Greeks (Ἕλληνας) in the Septuagint.[38] Qumran texts from no later than the first century BCE indicate that some Jews were expecting an eschatological war against the Philistines as part of a coalition with Egypt.[39]

Evidence of contemporary resentment, however, does not explain the allegory's implicit claim that the Philistines were a major problem for the Jews back in the Ptolemaic century. For a possible explanation, we may turn to a source that is problematic but nevertheless routinely cited in the literature, the so-called "Tobiad romance" (Josephus, *Ant*. 12:154–236). The difficulties of this piece are well-known and cannot be explored here.[40] A rough scholarly consensus sees it as a *novella* with a historical core, at least in the features of the world it depicts. Until recently, scholars tended to agree that Josephus misplaced the third century Tobiad tale into the second century, but new arguments for leaving it where Josephus puts it have reopened the question.[41] Since I will suggest below that *1 En* 90:4 depicts the historical background for understanding aspects of the Tobiad tale, the dating problem affects only the relative proximity of that background to the rise of the Tobiads.

At one point in the tale, Hyrcanus, the precocious son of Joseph the Tobiad, travels to Alexandria along with other "leading men of Syria and the region subject to [Ptolemy]" (πρῶτοι τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς ὑπηκόου χώρας) in order to celebrate the birth of Ptolemy's son (*Ant*. 12:196). He attends a banquet with the king, attended also by jealous rivals described as "leading men of the region" (πρῶτοι τῆς χώρας; *Ant*. 12:210). Since it soon becomes clear that these men are familiar with the ruthless tax-farming practices of Hyrcanus's father back in Syria-Palestine (cf. *Ant*. 12:180–184) and that they wish to create a scandal out of these practices, they are probably the "leading men of Syria" mentioned earlier, and the χώρα in *Ant*. 12:210 should be

---

[38] Interestingly, we are told that these Philistines/Greeks "devour Israel with their whole mouth." The LXX also gives fresh emphasis to 1 Sam 17:44–45, where David replies to Goliath's query, "Am I a dog?" with, "No, *worse* than a dog" (οὐχὶ, ἀλλ' ἢ χείρων κυνός).

[39] 4Q*462* i 13–14; 1QM i 1–5.

[40] For a recent discussion with basic bibliography, see Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California, 1998), 99–109.

[41] Daniel R. Schwartz, "Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?" in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (ed. M. Goodman; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 47–64; also Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSS 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 214–221. The debate continues: Gideon Fuks, "Josephus' Tobiads Again: A Cautionary Note," *JJS* 52/2 (2001), 354–356; and Daniel R. Schwartz, "Once Again on Tobiad Chronology: Should We Let a Stated Anomaly be Anomalous? A Response to Gideon Fuks," *JJS* 53/1 (2002), 146–151.

understood as *Hyrcanus's* homeland rather than Egypt. Hoping to embarrass Hyrcanus before the king, these men during the course of the feast pile all of their bones in front of Hyrcanus and then supply the jester Tryphon with an appropriate wisecrack:

> "My lord, do you see the bones lying before Hyrcanus? From this you may guess that his father [Joseph Tobias] has stripped all Syria in the same way as Hyrcanus has left these bones bare of meat." The king then laughed at Tryphon's words, and asked Hyrcanus why there were so many bones lying before him, and he replied, "It is natural, my lord; for dogs eat the bones together with the meat, as these men do"—and he looked toward those who reclined there, indicating that there was nothing lying before them—, "but men eat the meat and throw the bones away, which is just what I, being a man, have now done". (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:212–213 [Thackeray LCL])

There are similarities between the imagery of this passage and *1 En* 90:4:

> And I watched until that flock had been devoured by the dogs and the eagles and the kites, and they left on them not a bit of flesh, or skin, or sinew; until only their bones were left standing. And even their bones fell to the ground. And the flock became few.

Of particular interest is the fact that Hyrcanus slyly insinuates that his rivals are "dogs." They may well have been. The association of dogs with Philistines was inspired by 1 Sam 17:44–45 and may not have been exclusive to the *An. Apoc.*[42] The πρῶτοι who came to Alexandria from Palestine to curry favor with the monarch or to bid for tax-farming rights are described in the Tobiad romance as "prominent men (who) purchased the right to farm the taxes in their several homelands (πατρίδες)," "chief men and magistrates of the cities of Syria and Phoenicia," "the wealthy men in each city," "chief men of Syria," and "those of eminent rank in the various ancestral lands" (*Ant.*

---

[42] In 1986 a Persian-era dog cemetery was discovered in Ascalon. Subsequent excavation has uncovered about 1500 partial or complete remains of uniform and carefully articulated dog burials. No fully-convincing explanation for these burials has yet been offered, but it is reasonable to suspect that the dogs were held sacred in some way. Evidence suggests that Phoenicians revered dogs as part of a healing cult, and what remained of Philistine culture was submerged into Phoenician culture in the exilic and post-exilic periods. At bare minimum, the sheer number of dog graves suggests that there must have been a conspicuous canine element within the religio-cultural milieu of Ascalon at the time. Seven dog burials from the same period have also been found at Ashdod, another Philistine city. See Lawrence E. Stager, "Why Were Hundreds of Dogs Buried at Ashkelon?" *BAR* 17/3 (1991), 27–42; Philip J. King and Lawrence E. Stager, *Life in Biblical Israel* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 83; Grabbe, *A History of the Jews*, 40. As late as the first century CE, a Jew might casually refer to Syro-Phoenicians as "dogs" (Mark 7:26–27), although it is hard to tell if this epithet was ethnically specific.

12:155, 168–169, 174–175). Among these would surely have been representatives of prosperous Philistine coastal cities like Gaza and Ascalon, and one suspects too that the consistent loyalty of these cities to Egypt would have put their πρῶτοι in excellent standing at the annual tax-farming auctions.[43] It is perhaps not coincidental that the first time Joseph acquired tax-farming rights for all of Palestine (something that gave "great pain to those who had come to Egypt from the cities"), he took back with him a battalion of troops and immediately set about humiliating Ascalon, putting to death twenty of its πρῶτοι and making a shocking example of the town (*Ant*. 12:179–182). This besting of the latter-day Philistines by a new kind of Jewish hero is one of several episodes in the romance that its readers are expected to applaud (cf. *Ant*. 12:224). The Tobiad romance could be either a revenge fantasy or an account of a genuine triumph; either way, behind it one can detect resentment over earlier occasions in which the dogs had the upper hand as Ptolemaic tax farmers, and they stripped the sheep to their very bones. The similarity in imagery between *1En* 90:4 and *Ant*. 12:212–213 hints at a situation that had become proverbial.

Explanatory Comments

90:2. And after this, I saw in my vision all the birds of the sky coming: eagles, falcons, kites, and ravens For the identifications of these four as Macedonians, Thracian/Anatolians, Ptolemaic Greeks, and Seleucid Greeks, see pp. 136–143. The four birds would roughly conform to the "four winds," the four cardinal points of the compass.

And they began to devour the flock, pecking out their eyes and devouring their flesh. The language is vivid but not phantasmagorical. Elsewhere in Jewish writings we find that ravens and eagles attack the eyes (Prov 30:17) and carnivorous birds seize lambs (*Let. Aris*. 146). The allegory may be suggesting that Hellenism has the *power to blind* beyond anything previously known. Authentic religious experience, "beholding the glory of Yahweh," is more difficult in the present age than ever before.

---

[43] For the vitality of these cities during the Hellenistic era, see Schürer (Vermes), *History of the Jewish People*, 2:98–108; and Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 94–96, 432 n. 80 ("Gaza was the most important port in southern Palestine"). For Gaza's unusually sturdy loyalty to Egypt, see Polybius 16:22a., and on this, Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 96; and Dov Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 19. Evidence for Ascalon is sketchier, but such clues as exist point to consistently strong Egyptian ties. See Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 94; and Schürer (Vermes) *History of the Jewish People*, 2:106–108.

90:3 that shepherd See *General Comments* for the suggestion that this is the shepherd on duty when Alexander appeared.

90:4 the flock became few. This may be taken as a historical claim that the population of Judea decreased dramatically during the Ptolemaic century, but words to this effect were also a common observation among those who felt that the curses of Deuteronomy 28 had befallen Israel. See Deut 28:62, and compare *1En* 103:9; Bar 2:13; and Pr Azar 14. These two explanations of "the flock became few" are not mutually exclusive, of course. See above, *General Comments*, for arguments that this verse describes both population decline and extreme economic exploitation.

90:6–12: The Fourth Period: The Seleucid Era

90 6. And behold, young lambs were born from certain white lambs, and these began to open their eyes, and to see, and to cry out to the flock. 7. But the flock did not respond to them, and did not listen to their words, and they were deaf in the extreme, and their eyes were extraordinarily and severely blind. 8. Then in the vision I saw how the ravens swooped down on those young lambs, and they seized one of those young lambs. And they dashed the flock to pieces and devoured them. 9. And I watched until horns emerged on those young lambs; but the ravens were crushing their horns. I watched until a large horn sprouted on one of the lambs, and their eyes were opened. 10. And it had regard for them, and their eyes were unbound. It cried out to the flock, and the male sheep (*dabēlāt*) saw it, and they all ran to it. 11. In spite of all this, those eagles, falcons, ravens, and kites continued to snatch at the flock, swooping upon them and devouring them. But the flock kept silent, while the male sheep were protesting and crying aloud. 12. And those ravens battled and contended with it, and they wanted to eliminate its horn, but they did not prevail against it.

Translation Notes

90:6 certain white lambs See note on 85:5 for this nuance of ዘከ፡ ፡.

90:7 But the flock did not respond to them, and did not listen to their words, and they were deaf in the extreme, and their eyes were extraordinarily and severely blind. This is essentially the reading of most Eth 2, with incidental support from a variety of Eth 1 MSS along the way (details in Tiller, *A Commentary*, 349, 351–352). There is a confusing mass

of readings for this verse, but after eliminating patent absurdities, the meaningful options for interpretation are really only two: either (1) the sheep are unresponsive to the pleas of the young lambs, being extremely deaf and blind, and nothing more; or (2) the sheep are unresponsive, deaf, blind, and *in addition* actively persecute the young lambs and prevail over them. The latter reading (favored by Tiller), is found only in MS *m*, but it enjoys partial support from *g, q*, and 2080*, which read with *m* at the end of the verse, "and their eyes were extraordinarily blind, and they prevailed."

90:10 And it had regard for them. So renders Black (*Book of Enoch*, 276). The unusual phrase, **ወርእየ ፡ ቦሙ ፡** , precisely reproduces the idiom of Ps 106:44: "*And he looked upon* the affliction of *them*" (ויראּ בצר להם). It is also possible to construe the Ethiopic as saying that the sheep (pl.) "had vision," or "had a vision" (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 356).

their eyes were unbound. Not very elegant English, but the intent is to show that a unique verb (**ፈተሐ ፡**) is employed here for the opening of the eyes.

the male sheep (*dabēlāt*) In the Ethiopic OT (including *Jubilees*), **ደቤላ ፡** unambiguously means "he-goat," but elsewhere there is evidence that the word could be used loosely for any male of the flock.[44] In the *An. Apoc*., the word occurs in 90:10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 31. All English translators since Charles have rendered **ደቤላ ፡** as "ram," chiefly because (1) **ደቤላ ፡** , like "ram," is emphatically male, and (2) the **ደቤላ ፡** of 90:31 appears to be the same as the figure called out from among the **አባግዕ ፡** ("sheep") in 89:52.[45] This is reasonable, but if the consistent and uniform Ethiopic evidence is to be taken seriously, the *An. Apoc*. maintains a semantic distinction between the rams of former times (89:12–14, 42–48) and the rams of the author's day (90:10–16, 31). The earlier term is דכר (4Q*205* 2 i 26; iii 29; 4Q*206* 5 ii 16), rendered with **በግዕ ፡** in 89:12 and **ሐርጌ ፡** in 89:44, the only two places where the Aramaic can be compared. All three words

[44] Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 1101. The LXX equivalent is τράγος.

[45] Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 208) and Tiller (*A Commentary*, 356) go beyond this circumstantial argument and cite in addition Dillmann's lexicon in order to justify translating **ደቤላ ፡** with "ram," but that is a circular appeal, since Dillmann cites only the *An. Apoc*. itself as evidence that **ደቤላ ፡** can specifically mean *aries* (*Lexicon*, 1101). Beyond the *An. Apoc*., the most that Dillmann can do is show that **ደቤላ ፡** is used in rare instances for male offspring of domestic animals in general, and in his *1 Enoch* translation, Dillmann refuses to render **ደቤላ ፡** with anything more specific than "der Junge" (*Das Buch Henoch*, 279). There are no "rams" in Leslau's lexicon under **ደቤላ ፡** (*Comparative Dictionary*, 120: "billy goat, bull, male of any animal").

mean "ram." The Aramaic term behind the peculiar ʸᵕᵬᵴ ፡ is very likely עתוד. According to some specialists, עתוד could be either a he-goat or a ram in biblical Hebrew.[46] It was taken for a *goat* in the LXX (עתוד = τράγος), but if Jastrow is correct it was used for *ram* in the Aramaic literary world.[47] To maintain the apparent distinction between the earlier דכר and the later עתוד, I render the former with "ram" and ʸᵕᵬᵴ ፡ with "male sheep," a clumsy option, but English provides only "ram" to designate an adult male sheep.

General Comments

Arriving at the Seleucid era, the narrative becomes more detailed and less cryptic, while sources for comparison become more plentiful. A dense cluster of favorite motifs from the allegory's "biblical" period returns with the first verses, which describe an abortive reform movement:

> And behold, young lambs were born from certain *white* lambs, and these began to *open their eyes*, and to see, and to *cry out* to the flock. But the flock did not respond to them, and did not listen to their words, and they were deaf in the extreme, and their eyes were extraordinarily and severely *blind*.
>
> (90:6–7)

The lambs come from *white* sheep, reintroducing color symbolism and the divine election it implies. In other words, the reform group comes of chosen stock. They *open their eyes* and see, indicating their enlightenment, their vision of the glory of God, an experience that reveals one's identity and purpose. They *cry out* to the rest of the flock, as did Elijah and the prophets (89:52–53). But even the best leadership cannot overcome such extreme *blindness* and extreme deafness as the flock now exhibits, and the reformers fare no better than the prophets did.[48]

The theme of leadership continues when Judas Maccabee appears, but he is only able to rally a minority to his revolt (90:10–11). Again, leadership has its limits. The allegorist evidently holds Judas in high esteem, however, since he is the undisputed leader during Israel's third and final great awakening (i.e., periods when eyes begin to open). This puts Judas in company with Moses (89:28) and Samuel (89:41).

---

[46] So *HALOT*, 903. Contrast *BDB*, 800 and *DCH*, 6.639. which list only "he-goat" for עתוד.

[47] Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1129. Contrast Gustaf H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (3d ed; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938), 326, who lists only the he-goat ("Ziegenbock").

[48] This is especially so if the minority textual reading is correct and the flock actually persecutes the reformers. See *Translation Notes* for 90:7.

Tiller describes the young lambs of 90:6–9 as "a small band of pre-Maccabean, militant, religious reformers" and probably the author's own group.[49] The history which follows may be summarized in this way: After their failure to sway their fellow Israelites, the Seleucids seize one of the reformers (90:8a) and commit further depredations against the Jews in general (90:8b). The reformers take up arms ("horns emerged on those young lambs"), but the revolt is put down by the Seleucids (90:9a). The appearance of Judas Maccabee at this point coincides with the opening of the eyes of other Israelites (90:9b). Verse 10a is obscure. The text translated here, "It had regard for them," could also be construed as, "They had vision," and the text also uses a unique verb to describe the opening of the eyes of the Israelites after they receive this attention from Judas (or after the vision that they experience). In any event, Judas appeals to other Jews, and a group of "male sheep" (previously unmentioned) take note and rally to him (90:10b). Attacks on the Jews continue, this time from a pan-Hellenic force. The larger population suffers in silence, while the "male sheep" cry out (90:11). The Seleucids do all they can to defeat Judas, but fail (90:12).

Explanatory Comments

90:6–7 young lambs There is no point of reference for the appearance of the reformist lambs and their futile efforts to enlist support, so this movement cannot be dated more precisely than between 198 and 170 (see below).[50] The transition to Seleucid sovereignty goes unmentioned, but this is not surprising. As Tiller points out, Antiochus III's attitude toward the Jews was generally benevolent, and the *An. Apoc*. has no interest in Gentile history *per se*. There are no allusions to the Persians in the allegory either.[51]

90:7 But the flock … did not listen to their words, and they were deaf in the extreme This section puts consistent emphasis on *aural* imagery in addition to the usual visual imagery. The sheep are not only blind, but deaf, and there is far more language than usual about crying out and remaining silent (90:6b, 7a, 10b, 11b). One reason for this unusual emphasis may be that the reformers are preachers. Without a legitimate temple, priesthood,

[49] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 101.

[50] For comparison with other traditions about religious awakenings during the Hellenistic era, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 399–400.

[51] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 350–351.

or king, and without any miraculous signs in evidence, the hoped-for spiritual awakening will need to come in response to the power of the spoken word.[52]

90:8 they seized one of those young lambs Most scholars see this as a reference to the death of Onias III in 170 (2 Macc 4:33–36; cf. Dan 9:26). If correct, it provides a helpful chronological marker. By calling Onias a "young lamb" the *An. Apoc.* claims the persecuted priest as one of the reformers. This may shed light on the author's ideology. Onias' reputation for principled resistance to Hellenism would have endeared him to the reformers, even if they did not have a spiritual investment in the Temple.[53]

the ravens … dashed the flock to pieces and devoured them Brief as it is, this notice contains four distinct elements that line up well with Antiochus' sack of Jerusalem in 169 as it is described in 2 Macc 5:11–21: Regular Seleucid forces (*ravens*)[54] slaughter (*dash to pieces*) Jews in general (*the flock*) and loot and enslave them (*devour them*).

90:9 And I watched until horns emerged on those young lambs; but the ravens were crushing their horns Tiller maintains that these lines have been widely misinterpreted. Since scholars generally agree that the lines to follow describe the rise of Judas Maccabee (vv. 9b–10), most of them assume that the battling lambs in the first part of verse nine are the Maccabee clan.[55] Tiller argues that they are not. It is clear from the text that Judas springs from among *the still-blinded* sheep, many of whom subsequently have their eyes opened by him (vv. 9b–10a), whereas the crushed horns of this earlier revolt belong to the young lambs whose *eyes are already opened* (v. 6).[56] Since the two eye-opening episodes are clear in the text, Tiller's analysis is almost certainly correct.

---

[52] This is only true of the original version of the *An. Apoc.*, which did not include 90:13–15 (see *General Comments* on 90:13–19, pp. 216–218). According to Tiller (*A Commentary*, 362), it is precisely because it was believed that miraculous signs accompanied some of Judas's later victories that the *An. Apoc.* underwent revision some four years after completion.

[53] See the discussion of possible reasons for supporting the revolt in Chapter Three (pp. 87–90).

[54] It is for this reason that the subsequent massacre committed by Seleucid lackey Apollonius the Mysian, under Philip the Phrygian, seems a less likely referent (2 Macc 5:22–26).

[55] So, e.g., Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 226; Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 237; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 208; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 43–44; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 276.

[56] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 355. Reese (*Die Geschichte*, 38) also sees clearly that the text describes two separate groups and two separate movements (90:6–9a and 9b–11), but he thinks the "male sheep" of 10b–11, who rally to Judas, are the same as the "young lambs" of the first, failed movement.

The existence of an armed revolt put down by regular Seleucid forces, after the sack of 169 but distinct from and prior to the Maccabean uprising, has ramifications for the debate over the causes of the persecution unleashed by Antiochus Epiphanes in 167. One of the major theories in this arena is that of Victor Tcherikover, summed up in an oft-quoted line: "It was not the revolt which came as a response to the persecution, but the persecution which came as a response to the revolt."[57] That is, an armed revolt was already underway in Jerusalem when Antiochus was turned back from Egypt in 168, and it was chiefly this that inspired the pogrom. More than anything else, Tcherikover's detractors have faulted his theory for lacking any textual support.[58] The contemporary witness of *1En* 90:9–10 refutes that allegation.[59] There are many other aspects of Tcherikover's theory, however, that cannot be substantiated from the *An. Apoc*.[60]

---

[57] Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 191.

[58] E.g., Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.281–282; John J. Collins, preface to Hendrickson reprint of Tcherikover's *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), xii; Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley: University of California, 1990), 869 n. 130; Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution," 246–247 nn. 22, 25.

[59] Tcherikover himself never seems to have noticed *1En* 90:9–10. Ironically, in view of the preceding note, I find only John J. Collins taking notice that *1En* 90:9 is relevant for Tcherikover's thesis (*Apocalyptic Imagination* [2nd ed.], 78–79). Goldstein (*IIMaccabees*, 95 n. 66) sees clearly enough that 90:9 implies an armed rebellion, but he avoids the problem by dividing up the text and assigning all of verses 6–9a to the third century (ibid., 86 n. 16). Even if there were evidence to support this, one would still need to explain why a Hasmonean-era editor decided to arrange the text as it now is. For a vigorous defense of Tcherikover's thesis, based not on *1En* 90:9–10 but on 4Q*248*, see Daniel R. Schwartz, "Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27–31 January, 1999* (ed. D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, D. Schwartz; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 45–56. The silence of 1 and 2 Maccabees about this earlier rebellion is not surprising. By the time those works were composed several decades later (they are generally dated towards the end of the 2nd c.), the earlier uprising would have seemed like a small and meaningless fizzle—something easily forgotten or ignored—compared with the glorious success of the Maccabean revolt. No such perspective would yet have been possible when the *An. Apoc*. was written.

[60] Tcherikover argues that the early revolt was the work of anti-Hellenistic insurgents with some pro-Egyptian sympathies, led by the Hasidim, and that it was motivated by socio-economic class differences as well as genuine outrage over the desecration of the Temple (*Hellenistic Civilization*, 187–198). None of this is impossible, but most of it receives no support from *1Enoch*. To judge by the testimony of the *An. Apoc*., the fundamental distinction drawn by participants in this earlier revolt is between Jews on the one hand who have spiritual sight and who are vocal and militant in their opposition to the Greeks, and Jews on the other hand who are "blind" and remain silent. No economic factors are visible. The

90:10 I watched until a large horn sprouted on one of the lambs, and their eyes were opened. The precise relationship between Judas's debut and the opening of the eyes of the sheep is unclear.

It cried out to the flock, and the male sheep (*dabēlāt*) saw it, and they all ran to it. The "male sheep" who rally to Judas have often been identified with the Hasidim (1Macc 2:42). They may well be, but this cannot be demonstrated.[61] Judas's role in recruiting support ("It cried out to the flock") matches the sketch in 2Macc 8:1–7 much better than 1Macc 3:1–2, where he simply takes over the reins of a family-run enterprise upon his father's death.

90:11–12 In spite of all of this, those eagles, falcons, ravens, and kites continued to snatch at the flock, swooping upon them and devouring them. But the flock kept silent, while the male sheep were protesting and crying aloud. And those ravens battled and contended with it, and they wanted to eliminate its horn, but they did not prevail against it. These battles are probably the early Maccabean victories (1Macc 3:10–26, 38–4:27; 2Macc 8:5–36). The pan-Hellenic force (eagles, falcons, ravens, and kites) is in keeping with 1Macc 3:10 and especially 2Macc 8:9 (παμφύλων ἐθνη; "gentiles of all nations"). The contrast between protesting rams and acquiescent sheep finds an echo in 1Macc 3:56, but especially in 2Macc 8:13. The continuing atrocities committed against the sheep as a whole ("tearing," "swooping," "devouring") are implied in 2Macc 8:28, 30, but barely hinted in the hymns of 1Macc 3:45, 51. The consistently stronger accord between the *An. Apoc.* and 2Maccabees is striking. Finally, the failure of the ravens to defeat Judas puts the *An. Apoc.* before 160, as scholars frequently note. It is possible that the allegorist knew of the death of Judas and chose not to mention it, but the strong whiff of gloating in 90:12 tells against this.

---

only detectable social dynamic is a generation gap between young militants (horned young lambs) and an older general population (the flock). The *An. Apoc.* is unconcerned about the desecration of an already-defiled Temple. There is no preference for Egypt or Syria: one bird is as bad as another. In short, only Tcherikover's anti-Hellenist motive finds support in this allegory.

[61] Previous generations of critics have been quite confident in this identification, but current scholarship tends to emphasize how little is known about the Hasidim. See Tiller's survey (*A Commentary*, 109–115, 356). Neither he nor Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 363, 400) are willing to identify any of the rebel sheep in 90:6–19 with the Hasidim or any other known group (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 115–116).

90:13–19: The Final War

90 16. All of the eagles, falcons, ravens, and kites assembled, and they brought with them all of the wild sheep. So they all came together, and they gave each other assistance so that they might smash to bits the horn of that male sheep.

17. And I watched that man who was writing the book according to the command of the Lord, until he opened the book of destruction caused by the last twelve shepherds, and in the presence of the Lord of the flock he showed that they had destroyed far more than their predecessors.

18. And I watched until the Lord of the flock came to them. And he took in his hand the rod of his wrath and struck the earth; and the earth split open.

And all the beasts and all the birds of the sky fell away from the flock, and they sank into the earth, and it covered over them.

90 13. And I watched until the shepherds, the eagles, the falcons, and the kites came, and they called upon the ravens to smash to bits the horn of that male sheep.

And they did battle with it and waged war, and as it fought against them it cried out for its help to come.

14. And I watched until that man came who was writing the names of the shepherds and bringing them up before the Lord of the flock.

And he helped it and revealed everything to it: the help of that male sheep came down.

15. And I watched until the Lord of the flock came upon them in wrath. And all who saw him fled, and they all fell away, into the shadow before his face.

19. And I watched until a great sword was presented to the flock.

And the flock went out against all the wild beasts to kill them. And all the beasts and the birds of the sky fled from before their faces.

Translation Notes

90:13–19 For the "doublet," see the *General Comments* below.

90:14 the help of that male sheep came down. Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 211) and Tiller (*A Commentary*, 358) prefer the reading of *g* and 2080*: "He came down to help that male sheep."

90:16 wild sheep. There are two alternatives to "wild sheep." First, there is a MS variant, "wild donkeys" (*b*, *d*, h^{mg}, *n*, *x*, Ull, 4437, 6281*), which

should be taken more seriously than it has been. Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 44) accepts it as original, but Tiller simply points it out in passing (*A Commentary*, 363: "Some later MSS read 'asses'"), and Nickelsburg does not even mention it. Among the MSS with "wild donkeys" are Ull and *n*, which are Eth 2 MSS with proven text-critical value, and 6281*, an Eth 1 MS (skillfully corrected to "wild sheep," and so not noticed by Tiller). One Eth 2 MS (4750) has a double reading ("donkeys sheep"). In its favor, it is difficult to explain how or why "wild donkeys" would have entered the textual tradition as a corruption, and it happens to make sense historically (see below, *Explanatory Comments* on 90:16). Second, Tiller (*A Commentary*, 363–364), thinks "wild sheep" makes poor sense in context and emends to "wild beasts." Reese suggested the same thing in 1967 (*Die Geschichte*, 40 n. 141). Nickelsburg accepts Tiller's emendation (*1 Enoch 1*, 388–389), but inexplicably reverts to "wild sheep" in his commentary (p. 400). In any event, (1) "wild sheep" still has much better manuscript support than "wild donkeys," and (2) the arguments for emending the text to "wild beasts" are far from compelling.

90:18 And he took in his hand the rod of his wrath. 2436: "And he took a rod in his hand, in wrath." "in wrath" is the phrase used in verse 15.

General Comments

Building on earlier suggestions by Martin and Charles, Tiller presents a convincing case that verses 13–15 and verses 16–18 are literary doublets. The last historical events of the original apocalypse are the battles of 90:11–12 (166–165 BCE). The author believed the end was drawing near, and he wrote verses 16–18 not as history but as genuine prophecy. But Judas went on to score victories at Beth-zur in early 164 (1 Macc 4:29–34; 2 Macc 11:6–12) and later on at Carnaim in mid-163 (1 Macc 5:43–44; 2 Macc 12:22). Someone, perhaps the original author, then updated the allegory in order to reflect these battles (our vv. 13–15). Subsequent copyists had both editions and simply kept the readings of both versions.[62] I differ from Tiller only in that I

[62] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 63–79. Attempts to refute Tiller's analysis have so far been unpersuasive (e.g., Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 397–398; Bryan, *Cosmos*, 38–39, 181–182). Berner (*Jahre, Jahrwochen, und Jubiläen*, 178), after a detailed discussion, concludes: "Tiller's reconstruction is the most reasonable, because it is able to resolve the tensions in the text in a simple manner, without resorting to complex layers that have no clear basis in the text" ("TILLERs Rekonstruktion ist am einsichtigsten, weil sie die Spannungen des Textes auf einfache Weise zu lösen vermag, ohne komplizierte Schichtungen vorzunehmen, die einer klaren textlichen Basis entbehren").

think verse 19 was added as part of the revision as well. It reflects the battle of Adasa in March, 161 (1 Macc 7:39–50; 2 Macc 15:15–17) and serves to update the latter part of verse 18.[63]

The three battles added to the second edition match the sequence of the accounts of them in both First and Second Maccabees, but the *An. Apoc.* and 2 Maccabees also feature very similar supernatural elements, none of which are found in 1 Maccabees.

1 Enoch 90	*2 Maccabees*
13b. And they did battle with it and waged war, and as it fought against them it cried out for its help to come. 14. And I watched until that man came who was writing the names of the shepherds and bringing them up before the Lord of the flock. And he helped it and revealed everything to it: the help of that male sheep came down.	11:6. When Maccabeus and his men got word that Lysias was besieging the strongholds, they and all the people, with lamentations and tears, prayed the Lord to send a good angel to save Israel …. 8. And there, while they were still near Jerusalem, a horseman appeared at their head, clothed in white and brandishing weapons of gold. 9. And together they all praised the merciful God, and were strengthened in heart, ready to assail not only humans but the wildest animals or walls of iron. 10. They advanced in battle order, having their heavenly ally, for the Lord had mercy on them.
15. And I watched until the Lord of the flock came upon them in wrath. And all who saw him fled, and they all fell away, into the shadow before his face.	12:22. But when Judas's first division appeared, terror and fear came over the enemy at the manifestation to them of him who sees all things. In their flight they rushed headlong in every direction, so that often they were injured by their own men and pierced by the points of their own swords.
19. And I watched until a great sword was presented to the flock. And the flock went out against all the wild beasts to kill them. And all the beasts and the birds of the sky fled from before their faces.	15:15. Jeremiah stretched out his right hand and gave to Judas a golden sword, and as he gave it he addressed him thus: 16. "Take this holy sword, a gift from God, with which you will strike down your adversaries."

[63] Goldstein's accounting for verse 19 is similar (*I Maccabees*, 42 n. 12).

The revision of the apocalypse probably took place shortly after the victory at Adasa. The report of a heavenly sword was added, and the reference to the earth opening up and swallowing the enemy was removed, since it obviously had not happened. Beyond those two items the original eschatological battle scene in 90:18b was hardly revised at all, and 90:19b is not an entirely accurate account of Adasa. It agrees with 1Maccabees that the enemy fled ignominiously (1Macc 7:44), that they were pursued not only by Judas's forces but by the men of Israel generally (i.e., "the sheep") (7:45–46), and that they were annihilated (7:46). But there is nothing in 1–2Maccabees to suggest that Nicanor, the Seleucid general, brought a force with him from Jerusalem that was wholly or even predominately made up of non-Greek allies. To the contrary, we are told that the army was reinforced by Seleucid regulars (1Macc 7:39). The impression that this battle was largely waged against "beasts" (90:19) is therefore contradicted by other records. We have come to the extremity of the *An. Apoc.*'s competence as a contemporary reporter.

Explanatory Comments

90:13 And I watched until the shepherds, the eagles, the falcons, and the kites came, and they called upon the ravens to smash to bits the horn of that male sheep. This agrees with reports that in the wake Judas's early victories the Seleucid allies appealed to the higher Syrian authorities for assistance (clearest in 2Macc 8:8; but see 1Macc 4:26–27 and 3:26–27). The mention of angels ("shepherds") among the anti-Jewish coalition is surprising, but in a different context Jason of Cyrene records an angelic vision taken as a good omen by the Seleucids (2Macc 5:1–4), a kind of counterpart to his three angelic interventions on behalf of the Jews (3:24–36; 10:29–30; 11:8).

It may be noted that 90:13a represents a rewrite of 90:16 in its entirety, while 90:13b is entirely new, additional information.

90:14 And I watched until that man came who was writing the names of the shepherds ... And he helped it and revealed everything to it: the help of that male sheep came down. The heavenly auditor comes to the assistance of Judas. This, plus the fact that he is one of the seven archangels (90:22), suggests that he is Michael, Israel's martial champion among the angels (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1; 1QM xvii 6).

Again it may be noted that 90:14a represents a rewrite of 90:17 in its entirely, while 90:14b is new information.

90:15 And all who saw him fled, and they all fell away, into the shadow

before his face. See Chapter Two for parallels with the account of the exodus. The Gentiles who fight Israel fall into darkness, the equivalent of being blind. Or, with a small emendation (ጽላሌ፡ for ጽላሎት፡), they fall into a state of blindness.

The method of the author/editor remains clear and consistent if we disregard the misleading Ethiopian versification: 90:15 is the rewrite of 90:18a; 90:19a is the new information to be added at this point; and 90:19b is the rewrite of 90:18b.

90:16 All of the eagles, falcons, ravens, and kites assembled, and they brought with them all of the wild sheep In the original *An. Apoc*., these lines probably marked the point where *vaticinus ex eventu* became genuine prophecy. However, if the textual variant "wild donkeys" is correct (see *Translation Notes*), verse 16 is still in the arena of past history, and true prophecy begins with verse 17. This option is not unattractive. Wild donkeys (= Ishmaelites) do appear at this point in the Maccabean histories (the Arabs of 1Macc 5:39 and 2Macc 12:10), and the final audit of verse 17 would be a fitting transition point. If "wild donkeys" is correct, the allegory never speaks at all of Jews in collaboration with the Hellenists. Nevertheless, the strength of manuscript support is heavily in favor of "wild sheep," in which case the most probable interpretation is that the allegorist expects renegade Jews to take up arms as allies with the Greeks against the Maccabean revolt. This observation has ramifications for understanding the background of the Maccabean conflict as depicted in the *An. Apoc*.

There are reports of Jewish collaborationists who were willing to participate in Antiochus's persecution (1Macc 1:52–53; Josephus, *Ant*. 12:252; cf. Dan 11:30) and who sided with the Seleucids once the revolt began (1Macc 6:21; 2Macc 13:3), but the *An. Apoc*. ignores these sheep and apparently expects the more serious threat from renegades to materialize in the (near?) future. The *An. Apoc*. is therefore embarrassing for a well-known scholarly reconstruction of the pre-history of the Maccabean revolt, associated especially with Elias Bickerman and Martin Hengel.[64] These scholars envision a crisis precipitated by powerful, militant, Hellenizing Jews on the one side and traditionalist Judaism on the other. Bickerman and Hengel point to the numerous references in 1Maccabees to "many" who go along with the Hellenizing program (1Macc 1:11, 43, 52; 2:16; cf. Dan 9:27), and they enroll these

[64] Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill, 1979); 76–92; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.277–309.

among the militant Hellenizers, so that the Maccabean revolt becomes virtually a civil war.[65] But the *An. Apoc.*'s portrait of the Jewish population opposed to the reformers does not support this. In the early days of the Hellenistic occupation the sheep cry out (90:3), that is, they appeal to God concerning their oppression, as in the days of the exodus (89:19–20). But in the author's own day the sheep are "blind" and "deaf" to the entreaties of the reformers (90:7), and even though some of them open their eyes at the time Judas appears on the scene (90:9b–10a), they remain silent when the birds attack them (90:11), so that it is only the reformers and the rebels who cry out (90:6, 10, 11, 13). In all of this it is not hard to see a portrait of the general population through the lens of a frustrated member of a reform movement, but even so, the portrait is not unbelievable. The majority show no interest in joining anyone's fight but prefer instead to keep a low profile until the current troubles blow over, submitting to the powers that be and keeping their mouths shut (stubbornly remaining "blind," in Pseudo-Enoch's parlance). The "many" willing Hellenizers of 1 Maccabees may best be read against this background of compliance and passivity. The fact that the contemporary and patently anti-Hellenist *An. Apoc.* says nothing in 90:2–15 about sheep working in cooperation with the birds of prey is problematic for the Bickerman-Hengel construct, especially since the reference to "wild sheep" in verse 16 (if the text is correct) proves that the allegorist has a color on his palette ready to use when the time comes for depicting collaborationist Jews.[66]

90:17 he showed that they had destroyed far more than their predecessors. The fact that the shepherds of the Seleucid era destroy far more than their earlier comrades could be a reflection of their unusual malice, but it could also be a hint that they had less time than the others to effect the amount of slaughter they thought was appropriate. On this, see the discussion in Chapter Three (pp. 107–108).

90:18 they sank into the earth, and it covered over them. Compare 89:26–27. The fact that language echoing the exodus occurs in both the first edition (v. 18) and the second (v. 15) indicates that it was an original element here.

---

[65] Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees*, 90; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.289–290.

[66] The minority MS reading in 90:7 indicates persecution of the reformers by the general population, but even if this weakly-attested reading is accepted, it gives Bickerman and Hengel less than they need, since this activity all takes place before Heliodorus's attempt to loot the Temple (90:8a; cf. 2 Maccabees 3).

90:20–27: The Last Judgment

90 20. And I watched until a throne was erected in the pleasant land, and the Lord of the flock seated himself upon it. And he took up all of the sealed books, and they were opened in the presence of the Lord of the flock. 21. Then the Lord summoned those men, the first seven white ones, and commanded that they bring [the stars] before him, beginning with the first star (the one that preceded the stars whose private parts were like the privates of horses), indeed, the first star that fell at the beginning. And they brought them all before him. 22. Then he spoke to that man who had been writing in his presence (who was one of those seven white ones), and he said to him: "Seize those seventy shepherds, to whom I delivered the flock, and who, having received them, killed far more than they were commanded." 23. And behold I saw all of them bound, and they all stood before him. 24. And judgment was first held over the stars, and they were judged and found guilty. And they went to the place of damnation, and they were cast into a deep (place), and it was full of blazing fire and full of a pillar of fire. 25. Then those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty, and they were cast into that abyss of fire. 26. And at that moment I saw that a particular abyss, which was full of fire, was opened up in the middle of the land. Then were brought those blinded lambs, and they were all judged and found guilty, and they were cast into this depth of fire and burned up. And this abyss was to the south of that house. 27. And I saw those lambs burning; even their bones were burning.

Translation Notes

90:20 they were opened. Reading the plural of Tana, *t*, and 6281 ("they opened them") as a periphrastic passive. Other MSS have the singular: "he opened them."

90:21 those men, the first seven. "men" is omitted in all Eth 2 MSS.

and commanded that they bring [the stars] before him … The syntax of the verse is difficult, but the reconstruction proposed by Tiller (*A Commentary*, 370), is unnecessarily complex. "Bring" is not intransitive, so its object must have fallen out of the text, probably "the stars." Restore it, and the whole verse reads well.

indeed, the first star that fell at the beginning. Most editors bracket this line as dittographic (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 370), but without compelling reasons. The Ethiopic begins a little strangely (**ወለኮከብ ፡ ቀዳማዊ ፡**

…), but I take the ለ as resumptive, an informal object marker after the long parenthetic interruption separating "star" (ኮከብ ፡) from the verb, even though that verb (ያምጽኡ ፡ "they might bring") lacks the expected pronomial suffix for this kind of construction.[67]

90:24 full of blazing fire and full of a pillar of fire. There are several minor variants in the MSS for these lines. 2436 is unique in dropping the "and" before the final clause: "full of fire and burning, full of a pillar of fire."

General Comments

It cannot be said that the Last Judgment scene in the *An. Apoc*. has gripped the imagination of modern commentators. Nickelsburg speaks of "a series of stereotyped events,"[68] while Tiller finds the whole scene so "conventional" that he can see "no plausible way to draw historical or theological inferences."[69] If the Last Judgment scene seems stereotypical or conventional, this in itself may indicate the narrative and theological purposes of the scene within the broader context of the allegory as it winds down to its conclusion. The next three scenes in the *An. Apoc*. are the Last Judgment (90:20–27); the New Jerusalem (90:28–36); and the advent of the true Jacob/Israel (90:37–38). When the three are examined together, the narrative strategy becomes clear. Before the allegorist presents his unique and idealistic vision of the Abrahamic covenant fulfilled, he clears the deck by fulfilling the eschatological expectations of other Jews as much as possible. First come all of the expectations of judgment as announced in Enochic prophecy (in the "Book of the Watchers"). Second come all of the expectations of victory and restoration as found in biblical prophecy (in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms). The allegorist's own vision comes third.

The author may be writing within the Enochic tradition, but he has introduced some original, and therefore potentially controversial, elements: a second set of wicked angels in addition to the traditional Watchers, and a novel metaphor for distinguishing righteous humanity from wicked (sightedness vs. blindness). Therefore the main business of the Last Judgment scene (90:20–27) is to integrate the new elements into the old tradition without disruption, consigning the 70 angel shepherds and the blinded sheep to the same fates that the "Book of the Watchers" prescribes for the fallen Watchers and for wicked humanity.[70]

---

[67] Dillmann takes a similar approach (*Das Buch Henoch*, 64).

[68] *1 Enoch 1*, 403.

[69] *A Commentery*, 368.

[70] See *1 En* 10:6, 12–14; 18:11–16; 21:6–10; and 27:1–2. Tiller (*A Commentary*, 368) is cognizant

The Last Judgment scene, then, is almost entirely for the consumption of Enochians. With the exception of the contemporary Daniel 7, there are few biblical echoes in the scene.[71] In vivid contrast, the account of the New Jerusalem (90:28–36) exhibits no distinctly Enochic themes, but it manages to fulfill a staggering array of biblical prophecies.[72] Just as the respectful summarization of biblical history in the first half of the allegory may well have earned it a reading among some non-Enochic Jews, so now the mass fulfillment of biblical prophecy assures nervous or skeptical readers once again that the *An. Apoc*. affirms their common Jewish tradition.

Beyond the two tasks of fulfilling the dark expectations of Enochians and the bright expectations laid out in the common scriptures, there is really no further preparatory work that the allegorist needs to do. The *negative* expectations of the biblical prophetic tradition are lacking in detail, thanks to a tepid or non-existent belief in post-mortem judgment. The Enochic tradition here does not present an alternative so much as it fills a void. On the other hand, the *positive* expectations of the Enochic tradition as found in the "Book of the Watchers" call for a return to a paradisiacal existence (*1En* 10:17–19; 24:1–26:6), but this is not a problem since a recovered Edenic state is also a feature of the allegory's vision (90:38).

Ever the diplomat, the allegorist presents his own proposal only after he has satisfied as many of his Jewish readers as possible that he has no real quarrel with most of their current expectations. If this analysis is correct, the "conventional" quality of the Last Judgment scene is no accident.

Explanatory Comments

90:20 And I watched until a throne was erected in the pleasant land, and the Lord of the flock seated himself upon it. Nickelsburg notes that this scene resembles the scene in Dan 7:9–12, except that it takes place in the "pleasant land" (cf. Ps 106:24) instead of heaven.[73] It is doubtful that

---

of this aspect of the Last Judgment account in the *An. Apoc*. ("a straightforward reproduction of the Enochic traditions about the final judgment").

[71] *1En* 90:26 recalls Zech 14:5 and *1En* 90:27 recalls Isa 66:24. There may be a reminiscence of Jer 49:19b in *1En* 90:25.

[72] The relevant biblical passages can be found in Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 214–215, and in the marginalia of Tiller, *A Commentary*, 373–374; and Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 209–211. The list of allusions and parallels that have been adduced between *1En* 90:20–27 and biblical prophecy includes: Deut 30:3–8; Psalm 87; Isa 1:26; 2:2–3; 4:3; 14:1–2; 49:19–22; 54:11–12; 60:1–22; 62:3–5; 65:19; 66:12, 19–21; Ezek 34:11–13, 16; 37:24–28; 36:37–38; 40:2–48:35; Mic 4:1–8; Zeph 3:17; Hag 2:7–9; and Zech 2:6–13; 8:7, 23; 10:10.

[73] Nickelsburg, *1Enoch 1*, 403.

the difference was meaningful in Enochic tradition. In the "Book of the Watchers" God descends to a mountaintop to conduct the Last Judgment (*1En* 1:4; 25:1–6), but God's mountain reaches to heaven (17:2; 18:8). Since God dwells among humanity from this point forward in the allegory, the distinction between heaven and earth has little meaning.

90:21 beginning with the first star (the one that preceded the stars whose private parts were like the privates of horses), indeed, the first star that fell at the beginning. This is Asael (cf. 86:1–3), who is singled out as first to be judged. The importance of the leadership theme is perversely emphasized, as the first effective leader in the allegory receives individual condemnation for misusing his leadership skills (86:3).

90:22 "Seize those seventy shepherds, to whom I delivered the flock" The latter-day angels who misused their authority stand alongside Asael. It is easy to overlook the fact that the 70 shepherds are not solitary actors during their consecutive reigns. Each of them has an entourage of assistants (89:56, 68), putting each of them into a leadership role as well.

90:26 Then were brought those blinded lambs, and they were all judged and found guilty "Those blinded lambs" points back to the sheep explicitly designated as such in 90:7. They may be distinguished from other sheep who have opened eyes (90:9b–10a) but who nevertheless refuse to join the protests of the reformers or the revolt of Judas, as the "male sheep" do (90:10b, 11b). This may be compared with the situation with regard to the Gentiles. Gentiles who fight against Israel perish (90:18–19), but those who leave Israel alone survive and attain salvation (90:33, 38). If the minority text of 90:7 is correct and the blinded sheep actually persecute the reformers, the parallel is even stronger. Either way, there is reason to think the allegory countenances a portion of the flock who are not blind and yet do not support the revolt, and these are not condemned.

90:27 And I saw those lambs burning; even their bones were burning. Some have argued that this passage is corrupt,[74] but Mark Elliott suspects an allusion to Ezekiel 37 and plausibly suggests that the allegory is cutting off any possibility of future resurrection for these sheep, since even their bones are destroyed.[75] As the section which immediately follows (1) is largely dedicated to fulfillment of biblical prophecy, and (2) describes a coming resurrection of the dead (90:33), a commentary at this point on the reach of Ezekiel 37 would not be out of place.

---

[74] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 213–214; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 278.
[75] Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel*, 80 n. 89.

90:28–36: The New Jerusalem

90 28. Then I stood up to watch as he folded up that old house. And all the columns were removed, and every beam and ornament of that house was folded up along with it. It was then taken out and deposited in a certain place in the southern part of the land. 29. I watched until the Lord of the flock brought out a new house, greater and loftier than that first one, and he set it up on the site of the former one which had been rolled up. All its columns were new, its beams new, and its ornaments new and larger than those of the first—the old one which had been removed. And all of the flock was within it. 30. And I looked at all the flock that was left, and all the beasts which were on the earth and all the birds of the sky were prostrating and bowing down to the flock, making petition to them, and obedient to them in every matter. 31. After this, those three who were clothed in white and had seized me by my hand, they who had brought me up earlier, while the hand of that male sheep was also holding on to me—they lifted me up and set me down in the midst of the flock, unrelated to the judgment that had taken place. 32. And all of the flock was white, with their wool thick and pure. 33. And all who had been destroyed and dispersed, and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky, gathered together in that house, and the Lord of the flock rejoiced with great joy because all of them had become good, and they had returned to his house. 34. And I watched until they laid down the sword which had been given to the flock. They returned it to his house and they sealed it up before the face of the Lord. And all of the flock enclosed themselves within that house, but it was not able to contain them. 35. And the eyes of all of them were open, and they saw beautifully; there was not one among them that did not see. 36. And I saw that the house had become large and spacious and very full.

Translation Notes

90:28 he folded up. So *n, p**, and *y* (ጠወሞ፡, ጠወ·ሞ፡), a thin manuscript base, but the most sensible of the available options, since it accords well with the verbs that follow. The verb in Tana, "they transformed it" (ሜጥዎ፡) (= it was transformed) is also possible. The reading of all other MSS is difficult to construe: "he dipped it," "he immersed it" (ጠምዖ፡ and other spellings). Tiller (*A Commentary*, 374–375), followed by Nickelsburg (*1Enoch 1*, 403), emends to ጣምዎ፡ ("it was folded up").

90:29 And all of the flock was within it. MS *m* and many Eth 2 read, "And the Lord of the flock was within it."

90:30 in every matter. Lit: "in every word," probably going back to בכול מלה (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 377).

90:31 by my hand. 2436: "by my right hand" (**በየማንየ ፡** for **በእደየ ፡**).

unrelated to the judgment that had taken place. Usually translated "before that judgment took place," or the like (Tiller, *A Commentary*, 373). The judgment, however, ended with verse 27, and a flashback at this point is awkward since the present verse begins, "After this …" But **እንበለ ፡** can mean "without," "apart from," "regardless of," as well as "before" (Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 27).

90:33 all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky … had returned to his house. The notion of Gentiles *returning* to Jerusalem faithfully reflects Psalm 87, which claims that all peoples originated in Zion and anticipates their future return.

90:34 they sealed it. Tana and *q* only. Others: "he sealed it." As Tiller notes (*A Commentary*, 381), it is awkward to say that the Lord ("he") sealed up the sword before his own face.

but it was not able to contain them. Lit: "and it did not contain them." For the nuance, see Tiller, *A Commentary*, 381–382.

General Comments

As pointed out in the *General Comments* on the previous section, this portion of the allegory fulfills a broad spectrum of prophetic biblical expectations, some of which seem to be fulfilled simply for the sake of fulfillment. The submission of the Gentiles to the Jews (90:30) superficially satisfies the biblical demands (e.g., Isa 14:1–2; 60:10; 61:5; Zech 14:16), but the transformation in 90:38 will change that submission from a permanent state of servitude into a token gesture. The return of Enoch and Elijah (90:31) looks like another perfunctory fulfillment. Elsewhere in early Jewish tradition, Enoch and Elijah are martyred in an eschatological struggle between good and evil, but in the *An. Apoc.* their return serves no narrative purpose, and they are explicitly dissociated from "the judgment."[76]

[76] Richard Bauckham ("The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?" *JBL* 95/3 [1976], 447–458) thinks the element of martyrdom is a Christian addition to the tradition, but Matthew Black makes a strong case that both the return *and* the martyrdom are pre-Christian, based on *Apoc. El.* 5:30; *L.A.B.* 48:1; Wis 4:10–5:5; and Mark 9:9–13 ("The 'Two Witnesses' of Rev. 11:3 f. in Jewish and Christian Tradition," in *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube* [ed. E. Bammel, C.K. Barrett, and W.D. Davies; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978], 227–237).

The resurrection of the just, the gathering of the dispersion, the conversion of the Gentiles, the end of war, and the joyful congregation in the New Jerusalem are related in brisk fashion (90:33–34). As the commentaries make clear, none of these is unique to the *An. Apoc.*,[77] but the allegorist has integrated them into his own story by punctuating them with stronger than usual emphases on specific, trademark motifs of the allegory. It is not enough to say the sheep are white. We are told that "all of the flock was white, with their wool thick and pure" (90:32). It is not enough to say their eyes were opened. We are told that "the eyes of all of them were open, and they saw beautifully; there was not one among them that did not see" (90:35). The three dynamics by which humans "become good" (90:33b) are all present. The denizens of the New Jerusalem are white, betokening their divine election. They have "gathered together," "returned," and "enclosed themselves within that house," exercising the sort of uncoerced behavioral choices that are the product of free will. Finally, their eyes are fully opened, testifying to their enlightenment, the product of divine/human cooperation.

Explanatory Comments

90:28–29 he folded up that old house The folding up of the old Jerusalem and its deposit somewhere in the south are obscure, but the general impression is that the earthly city is to be regarded as something temporary, like the wilderness camp and Tabernacle, until the new, more permanent city can be built.

90:32 And all of the flock was white, with their wool thick and pure. Whiteness is depicted here as a *natural quality* for the sheep. A clean and healthy sheep is white. The same cannot be said for just any animal. This is highly significant because it means that the reader is supposed to take the normal whiteness of sheep into the equation when decoding the allegory. By implication, a Jew who is pure and strong will reflect something of the glory of the original (and also final) state of humanity in a way that Gentiles cannot. If a sheep is not its normal white color, something is *wrong*. It is dirty or sickly, something less than what it was born to be. The *election* inherent in whiteness therefore amounts to a *vocation* that applies to all Jews, not just a remnant. If you are a sheep, then *be a healthy sheep*. Indeed, if the logic of this remark in 90:32 is pressed hard enough, the separation between free will and predestination begins to break down,

[77] Charles, *Book of Enoch*, 215; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 373–374, 380–382; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 405–406.

which would not be entirely surprising since salvation in the *An. Apoc.* ultimately depends on the human/divine synergy that produces opened eyes.[78]

90:33 all who had been destroyed and dispersed "Destroyed" is the same verb that has been used frequently to describe the death of the sheep under the governance of the angel-shepherds in 89:60–70, so it is very probable that this refers to a resurrection.

90:37–39: The New Humanity

90 37. And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. 38. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle. The first one became a ⟨lamb⟩ among them, and that ⟨lamb⟩ became a great beast, and on its head were large black horns. And the Lord of the flock rejoiced over them and over all of the cattle. 39. And I fell asleep among them, and I awoke; and I saw everything.

Translation Notes

90:38 and they became all of them white cattle. The first one became a ⟨lamb⟩ among them. Eth 2 MSS (plus *g*) unambiguously make "the first one" (**ቀዳማዊ ፡**) the subject of the second clause. The Eth 1 MSS can be read exactly the same way, but they can also be read: "and they all became the former white cattle. There was a ⟨lamb⟩ among them." Tana in particular encourages this reading, adding **ወ-** before the first word of the second clause ("*And* there was a ⟨lamb⟩ among them …"). But Tana is notorious for its extraneous "and's." It may be noted that **ቀዳማዊ ፡** is singular while "they" and "cattle" are plural. Grammatically, this is not decisive, but **ቀዳማዊ ፡** most naturally reads as the subject of the second clause.

⟨lamb⟩ For this famous crux, see pp. 22–25 in Chapter One.

90:39 And I fell asleep Tana reads: "And I offered praise" (**ሰባሕኩ ፡** for **ሰከብኩ ፡**). Tana's variant is attractive because it seems out of place for Enoch, who is onstage with the animals (90:31), to undergo what

---

[78] The "Admonitions" strikes a similar note: "Seek out and choose for yourselves righteousness and an elect life" (*1En* 94:4).

sounds like an incubation rite or dream-vision experience in the midst of the joyful and climactic scene he has just described. With all eyes open and God among his people, what purpose can new dream revelations serve? Tana's reading avoids this problem, and may be correct, but there are other possible interpretations of the majority text; see *Explanatory Comments* below.

General Comments

The problems of text, translation, and interpretation have all been discussed in Chapter One. This is an instance in which a paraphrase may be more helpful to the understanding than a strict and literal translation:

> As I watched, a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. All the wild beasts and the birds feared it and continually directed their requests to it. Then, as I continued to watch, all of the different species were transformed, and all of them became white cattle as well. The first white bull had been a lamb among them, but now that lamb was a great beast with large horns on its head. The Lord of the flock was quite pleased with both of these manifestations, as he now was with the rest of the cattle. As for me, I fell asleep in the midst of them. Then I woke up. The whole thing was a vision.

The circle is finally closed. Jacob/Israel appears and receives the same homage from the Gentiles that the flock as a whole received in the New Jerusalem (90:30). This reinforces the identity between the white bull and the flock: both are Israel. But the miracle continues as a transformation returns all of humanity to the status of original humanity, with the improvement that there are no black or red cattle among the white. Jacob is like Adam, and the new and perfected Eden is indistinguishable from the ideal Israel, which had never been realized before this point.

Explanatory Comments

90:38 the first one The ambiguity of "the first one" may be deliberate, pointing back not only to Jacob but to Adam. *Eden regained* is an old Enochic hope (*1En* 24–25), but it is equally visible in other texts, like Psalm 87 and the Qumranic *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH[a] xiv 16; xvi 4–27).[79]

[79] Enoch tells his son Methuselah no less than three times that these dream visions happened before he took a wife (83:2 [bis]; 85:3). Her name is Edna (85:3; cf. *Jub* 4:19 "Edni"), the Aramaic equivalent of Eden. Enoch does not gain "Eden" until the *An. Apoc.* is completed. Is it fanciful to see a miniature allegory here?

large black horns The domestic bull (*bos taurus*) does not normally have black horns. Dillmann argues that the animal in view is the wild ox, or aurochs (ראם / רים; *bos primigenius*), and that black is simply the appropriate color.[80] David C. Mitchell develops this point at length, claiming that the aurochs did indeed have black horns.[81] This is incorrect. In Europe, the aurochs did not become extinct until the 17th century, and according to Cis van Vuure: "From the scarce aurochs horns that have been left, we can conclude that they were of a pale, whitish colour, and that only the tip was very dark to black."[82] Most likely, the difficult epithet "black" is the result of a double translation, going back to scribal confusion between ΜΕΓΑΛΟΙΣ and ΜΕΛΑΝΟΙΣ.[83] If so, "black" should be excised.

over them. All MSS have "over them." Nickelsburg offers no explanation for translating with, "over it."[84] "Them" probably refers to the two Jacobs just described, one a lamb and the other a white bull.

90:39 And I fell asleep among them, and I awoke; and I saw everything. It is difficult to explain Enoch's actions here. He is placed "in the midst" of the flock in 90:31, and now he falls asleep "among them" (both = ማእከለ።መ። ፡), awakening as if from an incubation oracle with a revelation. Tiller discusses various unpersuasive attempts to make sense of this verse, but the text may simply be corrupt or the product of a confused redactor.[85] One possible explanation is that Enoch sees himself in his dream going to sleep, and then awakens from his *real* sleep. This would blur the line between dream and reality, perhaps for literary effect, or perhaps to make the subtle point that the *An. Apoc*. may be allegorical, but it is not fantasy.

90:40–42: Epilogue

90 40. This, then, is the vision that I saw while I slept. And I awoke, and I blessed the Lord of righteousness, giving him praise. 41 And later I wept with great weeping, and my tears did not stop, until I could no longer bear it, but

---

[80] Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, 288.

[81] Mitchell, "Firstborn *Shor* and *Rem*," 216.

[82] Private correspondence, March 3, 2007. Van Vuure has written an exhaustive study on this animal: Cis van Vuure, *Retracing the Aurochs: History, Morphology and Ecology of an Extinct Wild Ox* (Sofia-Moscow: Pensoft Publishers, 2005).

[83] Black, *Book of Enoch*, 280.

[84] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 402–403.

[85] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 390–391.

they kept flowing down in response to what I had seen, for all of it is coming and will be fulfilled. All of the deeds of humankind appeared to me, each in its place. 42. That night I remembered the first dream, and I wept because of it, and I was troubled because I had seen that vision.

Translation Notes

90:40 This, then, is the vision The unique reading of 2436 is more emphatic: "And behold, this is the entire vision" (**ወናሁ ፡ ዝንቱ ፡ ኵሉ ፡ ራእይ ፡**).

90:41 but they kept flowing down. Tana, *q*, *t**. Other MSS yield poorer sense.

90:41 each in its place. **በበ ፡ ክፍሉ ፡** ("each in its *kefl*") This intriguing phrase is open to several translation possibilities, since *kefl* means "part," "allotted portion," but also "division," "category," "section." Translation depends on whether the notion of destiny is present (Black, *Book of Enoch*, 280), or whether this is merely a reference to the allegory's orderly presentation in chronological sequence.

General Comments

After a brief moment of blessing and praise following the vision (90:40), Enoch is plunged into extreme sorrow over what he has seen, because "all of it is coming and will be fulfilled." This downbeat ending is not expected. The point may be that Enoch now realizes that all the grief and bloodshed he has witnessed between his own day and the distant Eschaton is yet to come, except that he will witness it taking place with humans, not animals (cf. "the deeds of *humankind*" in v. 41). He also recalls with horror the first of the two dream visions (*1En* 83–85), a violent vision of the Deluge,[86] a catastrophe much closer to him in time. Enoch's anguish is so profound that it unexpectedly reopens the question of theodicy that the *An. Apoc.* is widely supposed to have settled: Even knowing the happy ending, is the whole thing worth the horror and pain? Literally the last thing we are told is that the vision has left Enoch "troubled." The *An. Apoc.* ends by tacitly relinquishing any implied claim that it has answered all questions, that it provides a full disclosure of the thoughts and ways of God.

---

[86] This is the usual interpretation, although it may be pointed out that there is not a drop of water in this description of the Deluge.

PART THREE

THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* AND THE ONGOING CONVERSATION

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* IN DIALOGUE

I have argued in the preceding chapters that the *An. Apoc.* can be read as a sophisticated theological interpretation of human history as well as a contemporary political document. The purpose of this final chapter is to place the findings of this study within a greater context. There are various ongoing conversations to which the *An. Apoc.* could make a valuable contribution, but from which it has thus far been absent.

The temporal model of past-present-future continues to be useful, if only as an organizing device. With regard to the past, the *An. Apoc.* is a historical-review apocalypse that takes an approach which is usually associated with *wisdom* literature. As such, the *An. Apoc.* may well have something of value to add to the relatively new explorations of the interaction between wisdom literature and apocalyptic literature. With regard to the allegory's contemporary situation—its present—the *An. Apoc.* could contribute much to our understanding of Jewish-Hellenistic encounter and the roots of the Maccabean conflict. As for the future, I believe that the consummation of history envisioned in the allegory finds its closest parallel in the thought of Paul the Apostle, and if so the *An. Apoc.* should be relevant to studies of the interrelation between nascent Christianity and forms of early Judaism. All three of these conversations are quite lively at present.

1. *Looking at the Past: The "Wisdom" Approach to History*

One of the central claims about the *An. Apoc.* in the present study is that the historical survey between the first Jacob/Israel and the future Jacob/Israel does not serve the purpose of tracking the road to salvation but consists of a series of moral vignettes illustrating the complex interplay of divine and human initiatives that make up moral responsibility. Above all, the lessons of history point to the importance of having one's eyes open to the glory of God. In the end, this is the only essential criterion for admittance into the world to come. This principle rises above all others and is presented as a genuinely universal truth, applying not only to Jews and Gentiles, but even to angels.

The period between the two Jacobs[1] may be divided into episodes: the bondage to and deliverance from Egypt (89:12b–27); the wilderness sojourn and the settlement (89:28–40); the era of Samuel and the united monarchy (89:41–50); the divided kingdom to the destruction of Jerusalem (89:51–58); the era of the 70 shepherd angels, itself a set of four episodes (89:55–90:19); the Last Judgment (90:20–27); the New Jerusalem (90:28–36). As the present commentary has shown, the motif of seeing-vs.-blindness figures prominently in each of these episodes. The only apparent exception is the first episode, in which God makes his first appearance. In that episode, it is *God* who does the seeing (89:16). After that the motif is used with human actors (and in one instance, angels). The motif does not evolve or develop from scene to scene. There is nothing about the open eyes in the time of the Maccabean revolt, for example, that represents a historical advance over the open eyes of the wilderness sojourn. Neither is the opening of eyes the result of particular historical circumstances such as the giving of the Law or the dedication of the Temple. It is intermittent, coming and going unpredictably. The experience of spiritual enlightenment affects history but is not dependent upon it. As presented in the *An. Apoc.*, Israel's history becomes one, long, sustained demonstration of an unchanging need for a historically transcendent experience.

This kind of history writing is usually found in wisdom literature.[2] Historical surveys can be found in several other Second Temple works that use the same approach, presenting history as a series of illustrations pointing to one overarching quality or set of principles. One example is Sirach 44–50, the famous hymn in praise of the ancestors, which provides a historical résumé from Adam to the high priest Simon. The survey focuses on human individuals rather than events or *magnalia Dei*, and it consists almost entirely of positive role models for anyone aspiring to piety and faith-

---

[1] In Chapter One I argue that the apocalypse presents history as *episodic* and nothing more, and that the various attempts to find a macrostructure have been unpersuasive (p. 28). Nevertheless, it is interesting in light of the present study that Devorah Dimant and Daniel Assefa both identify *Jacob* as a dividing point between sections of the *An. Apoc.* (Dimant, "[חנוך החבשי פה-צ] ההיסטוריה על-פי חזון החיות," מחקרי ירושלים מחשבת ישראל 1, 2 [1982], 18–37 [27]; Assefa, *L'Apocalypse*, 248 n. 24).

[2] Using a form-critical approach, Carol Newsom argues that this use of history is a relatively late, post-biblical development. In the OT, historical résumés first appear as brief, liturgical recitations associated with covenant renewal. Later they are used to illustrate not only God's acts but Israel's failures and punishment, as the curses of the covenant are perceived as actualized in Israel's history. This didactic and hortatory function developed naturally into the wisdom motif of history as a litany of moral examples. See Newsom, "Enoch 83–90," 1–6.

fulness. These qualities are *constants*. The record of the past demonstrates how these timeless qualities have consistently produced brilliant examples of glorified humanity from the beginning to the present. Significantly, Ben Sira attributes the glorification of the pious not to their obedience to God's will as revealed in covenant but directly to the piety of the individual. For Ben Sira, covenant-making is simply one of the rewards granted on occasion to certain people who have *already* been judged faithful (Sir 44:18, 20; 45:6–7, 23–24). Another historical survey appears in Wisdom 10–11. This one insists that Lady Wisdom has been actively involved in events from Adam to Moses, inspiring virtue and bringing salvation. Again, this presence is depicted as unchanging and transcendent. Like Ben Sira's piety and faithfulness, the hand of Lady Wisdom interacts with history but does not originate in history.[3] There is another historical résumé in the *Damascus Document*, briefly rehearsing the ancient record from the Watchers of Genesis 6 to the Sinai covenant (CD ii 14–iii 12). It all illustrates the two ways of stubborn defiance on the one hand and humble obedience on the other, providing examples of characters who followed each path, some of whom are angels. The point is that those who are currently choosing between the way laid out by the reformist community and the way of those who spurn it are confronted with the *same universal choice* that has existed in every era.

The notion of an unchanging principle, illustrated by history and in turn explaining that history, is a wisdom motif. It is noteworthy that it appears in undisputed examples of wisdom literature like Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon. In the case of the *Damascus Document*, it is probably no accident that the survey begins with a classic wisdom introduction: calling together the children and urging them to pay heed to the wise words of their father. "And now, children, listen to me and open your eyes in order to see and understand the works of God" (CD ii 14–15a).

In the case of the *An. Apoc.*, this wisdom approach to history appears within an apocalypse, an interesting combination since it is commonly held that wisdom literature and apocalyptic literature move in different orbits.[4] In recent years, however, this dichotomy has been challenged, and the

---

[3] This is very similar to the historical résumé in Hebrews 11, where the eternal operative principle is faith.

[4] According to Benjamin Wright and Lawrence Wills, "the notion that wisdom and apocalyptic represent fundamentally different categories, whether in literary genre or worldview, has persisted into current scholarship" (*Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* [ed. B.J. Wright III and L.M. Wills; SBLSymS 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005], 1).

interaction between wisdom and apocalypticism has been acknowledged and explored.[5] Add to this avenue of study the well-known observation that wisdom literature in the post-biblical period (Sirach, Wisdom) displays an interest in Israel's history that is entirely lacking in biblical wisdom literature (Proverbs, Qoheleth, Job), and it is not hard to see that the *An. Apoc*. would be a valuable conversation partner at this table. In fact, if the thesis of the present study has any merit, the *An. Apoc*. may be the most ambitious and sophisticated Second Temple example of history written from a wisdom perspective.

2. *Looking at the Present: The Jewish-Hellenistic Encounter and the Maccabean Revolt*

The arguments of Chapter Three and the *Commentary* on 90:6–19 suggest that the *An. Apoc*. has much to contribute to the ongoing conversation about the Hellenistic-Jewish encounter and the Maccabean revolt. We have seen, for example, that the *An. Apoc*.'s partial support for the Tcherikover thesis and its poor fit with the Bickerman-Hengel thesis could have an impact on the debate over the causes of the great persecution of 167.[6] It has also been noted that Onias III is apparently claimed for the allegorist's own reform group, even though the Second Temple is regarded as defiled in the *An. Apoc*.[7] This is potentially relevant to discussions about the relationship between the Jerusalem priesthood and politics during this era. There are many areas of investigation in and around the Maccabean revolt itself to which the *An. Apoc*. may make a worthwhile contribution, but to date it has been a badly underutilized resource.[8] Here, we must be content with a mere sketch of a few of them.

---

[5] The effort has been spearheaded by members of the Wisdom and Apocalyptic Group of the Society of Biblical Literature. The volume cited in the previous note represents a selection of significant studies published by members of this group between 1994 and 2004.

[6] See *Explanatory Comments* on 90:9 (pp. 212–213) and 90:16 (pp. 219–220).

[7] See *Explanatory Comments* on 90:8 (p. 212).

[8] There are no references to the *An. Apoc*. in such well-known works as W.W. Tarn, "Hellenism and the Jews," in *Hellenistic Civilization* (3d rev. ed. by W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith; Cleveland: World Publishing, 1952), 210–238; Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill, 1979); Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959); and the lengthy section dedicated to the Maccabean era in Schürer (Vermes), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 1:17–173. More recent studies, some quite comprehensive, also ignore the *An. Apoc*.; e.g., Klaus Bringmann, *Hellenistische*

It has been seen that the *An. Apoc*. agrees with both the general perspective and the historical details of 2 Maccabees more often than with 1 Maccabees. This affinity is somewhat surprising because Jason of Cyrene and the Enochic allegorist evidence radically different attitudes towards the Temple.[9] It is also surprising in view of the fact that many scholars have preferred 1 Maccabees as the better historical source, not only in its data but in its interpretations. For example, Goldstein thinks that the portrayal of Judas's revolt in 1 Maccabees as a war against traditional, biblical enemies is more historically accurate than the war against the Greeks depicted in 2 Maccabees.[10] From its vantage point within the period of the conflict itself, the *An. Apoc*. casts its vote decidedly in favor of Jason's characterization. Again, the supernaturalism of 2 Maccabees is sometimes taken as evidence of greater distance from the raw events than the miracle-free history of 1 Maccabees, but from the *An. Apoc*. it is clear that some of the signs and wonders in Jason's account must have been reported very shortly after the events (90:13–15, 19). Studies of 2 Maccabees would do well to take a greater interest in the *An. Apoc*.

Another surprise is the seeming indifference of the *An. Apoc*. to the life or death of the man Antiochus Epiphanes and to the persecution of 167 as such. It is true that the *An. Apoc*. never portrays any Gentile ruler, but this observation does not address the issue, since the entire allegory, including all of its chosen conventions, was apparently conceived beneath the shadow of Antiochus. This unexpected void in the *An. Apoc*.'s narrative could conceivably add fuel to a conversation recently begun. Two new studies of the

---

Reform und Religions-verfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdische-hellenistischen Geschichte (175–163 v. Chr.) (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenshchaften in Göttingen; philologische-historische Klasse 3.132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983); Daniel J. Harrington, *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (OTS 1; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988); Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Erich S. Gruen, "Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews," in *Hellenistic History and Culture* (ed. Peter Green; Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley: University of California, 1993), 238–274; Dov Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[9] Second Maccabees can accurately be called "Temple propaganda," while the *An. Apoc*. rejects that same Temple. See Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); and Tiller, *A Commentary*, 38–40.

[10] Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 385–386, 432–433. For typical expressions of enthusiasm for 1 Maccabees as the better historical source, see Bruce Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), 146; and Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus*, 151–185 (esp. 153–154, 174–177).

portrayals of Antiochus in Jewish sources have pointed out similarities between their "plot lines" and ones found in Babylonian literature and in Herodotus, respectively.[11] Such studies inevitably raise the suspicion that 1–2 Maccabees and Daniel could be basing their portrayals of Antiochus on pre-existing literary paradigms at least as much as on actual historical events. Could this explain Pseudo-Enoch's silence? One may suppose that the *An. Apoc.*'s disinterest in the Second Temple translates into a de-emphasis of Antiochus's desecration thereof, but where in the allegory are the other elements of the great persecution?[12]

Finally, the *An. Apoc.* might have something to contribute to the current, much broader debates about the meaning of Hellenism and the complex nature of the Jewish response to it.[13] Partially under the influence of post-colonialist theory, there has been within discussions of Jews and Hellenism a trend away from an imperialistic view of the Hellenistic kingdoms.[14] It is suggested, rather, that there was an "exchange of relations rather than a dominant culture over a subservient entity," and that the language of *Kulturkampf* is to be avoided as a "historical simplification."[15] Typically too, recent discussions stress the mixed Jewish reaction to the Greek world, sometimes positive, sometimes negative, sometimes both at once.[16] Thus far, the *An.*

---

[11] Steven Weitzman, "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution," *JBL* 123/2 (2004), 219–234; Paul Niskanen, "Daniel's Portrait of Antiochus IV: Echoes of a Persian King," *CBQ* 66 (2004), 378–386.

[12] Steven Weitzman is careful not to suggest that the horrors of the persecution are fictional, but he is clearly aware of the direction his argument may go ("Plotting Antiochus's Persecution," 222, 230). Paul Niskanen ("Daniel's Portrait of Antiochus IV," 378–386) believes Antiochus is omnipresent in Daniel, "lurking beneath the personas" of the kings in the early chapters as well as in the dream visions of chaps. 7–12 (ibid., 379), and he sees literary dependence on Herodotus in Daniel's portraits throughout, but the implications this could have for the historicity of the details in Dan 11:21–39 are not discussed.

[13] The literature is vast and growing. For an overview, see Lee I. Levine, *Judaism & Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1998), 6–32.

[14] See J.K. Aitken's retrospective book review of Martin Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* (*JBL* 123/2 [2004]), 334, where a number of recent works in this vein are discussed.

[15] Ibid., 334, 341. Cf. Levine, *Judaism & Hellenism*, 26 ("there was a range of responses to Hellenistic influences rather than a sharp dichotomy, a diversity rather than a polarity").

[16] See, e.g., G. Delling, "Die Begegnung zwischen Hellenismus und Judentum," *ANRW* 2.20.1 (1987), 3–39 (p. 38: "… Aufnahme und Ablehnung des Hellistischen in verschiedenem Grade und auf verschiedene Weise."); and various essays in John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling (eds), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (CJAS 13; Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 2001). This diversity and complexity is a recurring theme in Erich Gruen's treatments of Hellenistic-era Jewry (*Heritage and Hellenism*, *passim*; idem, "Jewish Perspectives on Greek Culture and Ethnicity," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, 62–93; idem, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002], 213–231).

Apoc. has been absent from these discussions. The Greeks, according to this allegory, are very much the dominating invaders of the older historical paradigm, uniformly bent on destruction and exploitation of the Jews and contributing to Jewish spiritual degeneracy ("pecking out their eyes"). Of course this is only one of many Jewish views, but in my opinion we do well to bear such works in mind. In adopting the more nuanced perspectives favored today, it should not be forgotten that we are taking on a mindset foreign to many of the people who lived in this historical arena, people whose literature we aspire to read with the sympathy any good historian needs. Distancing ourselves from the biases of the sources is all to the good, but the danger of such distancing is that we may slip imperceptibly into a position from which we no longer hear what the sources are saying. Hence, when J.K. Aitken criticizes the very idea of two cultures in opposition by suggesting that the idea "probably does not have a counterpart in the ancient writers,"[17] the *An. Apoc*. shows that he goes too far.

In the context of these discussions the question has been asked, "Did the Jews have a clear and consistent sense of Greeks as an ethnic entity?"[18] The *An. Apoc*. is useful here because it provides an unusually lucid answer to that question. One has only to ask, "What does 'bird-of-prey-ness' mean in this allegory?" The *An. Apoc*. appears to recognize an essential ethnic sameness running through all of the Greek kingdoms from Alexander to the Seleucids. The various species of predatory birds are bound together by that sameness, and that sameness also sets them apart from all previous enemies. Obviously the *An. Apoc*. is not unique in its negative portrayal of the Hellenes, but it does offer one of the best proofs that a fairly sophisticated abstraction of Greek ethnicity was already current during the Maccabean revolt. Moreover, the fact that the *An. Apoc*. can effectively communicate this abstraction in the coded language of allegory suggests that it was not the idiosyncratic intellectual property of one Jewish author. It might be fruitful to bring the *An. Apoc*. into conversation with a scholar like Tessa Rajak, who suspects that a strong and consistent Jewish-Greek dichotomy was not yet operative at the time of the Maccabean revolt, but only developed as part of the social construction of Palestinian Jewish self-identity in the late Second Temple period.[19]

---

[17] Aitkin, (review in *JBL* 123/2), 333.

[18] Gruen, "Jewish Perspectives," 62.

[19] Tessa Rajak, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (AGJU 48; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 3–9 (esp. pp. 6–7).

3. *Looking at the Future: The Eschatology of the* Animal Apocalypse *and the Apostle Paul*

If the analysis of the *An. Apoc.*'s theological system in this study is thought to be plausible, it would be a natural scholarly exercise to compare it with other Second Temple theological expressions. This field of inquiry includes the Jewish matrix from which Christianity eventually came forth, and it seems to me that the closest parallel to the theological vision of the *An. Apoc.* is in fact found in the writings of the Apostle Paul.[20] If so, this is another area in which the *An. Apoc.* might make a real contribution. Two areas where the similarities are particularly striking are (1) Jew-Gentile relations and the future of Israel, and (2) the Messiah conceived as both the seed of Abraham and a new Adam.

With regard to the first point, the *An. Apoc.* suggests that God's ultimate purpose in human history is not to glorify the nation of Israel but to abolish all nationalities entirely and return all of humanity to a single, Adamic state under the auspices of the true Jacob/Israel when he appears. All species become white cattle. In a similar manner, Paul believes that in God's master plan, the division between Jew and Gentile is to be abolished under the auspices of the Messiah, resulting in a united human family (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 12:13; and cp. Col 3:11; Eph 2:15–18; 3:6). Just as for the Enochic author this final humanity (white cattle) is neither Jew (sheep) nor Gentile (wild beasts), so for Paul those who are "in Christ" can be spoken of as a kind of third race (1 Cor 10:32; and cp. Eph 2:15), and even Paul's claim that anyone who is in Christ becomes a "new creation" (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15) is not dissimilar to the dramatic transformation of live animals into white cattle in *1 Enoch* 90:38.

A second area of potentially fruitful inquiry focuses on Abraham. Paul appeals repeatedly and enthusiastically to Abraham and God's covenant with him, because, like the author of the *An. Apoc.*, he sees Abraham as a potential patriarch for Gentiles as well as Jews (Gal 3:6–9; Rom 4:16). At one point Paul argues that the Abrahamic covenant has been opened to Gentiles because Christ is the true "seed" (singular) of Abraham, and being "in Christ" therefore puts one in the position of heir to the blessings of Abraham (Gal 3:16–18; cf. Gal 3:29; Rom 4:11–12, 16). The *An. Apoc.* anticipates Paul by two centuries in giving a similarly singular and "messianic" interpretation to

[20] To my knowledge, the only scholar who has taken any note of this is Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 85).

Abraham's "seed." Moreover, like Paul's Christ, the eschatological white bull's role in the allegory is to somehow be the catalyst by which the blessings of white-cattle status are bestowed on all peoples.

The macrostructure of history in Paul's model is very similar to the *An. Apoc*. By appealing to the Abrahamic covenant in Galatians 3 and Romans 4, Paul has managed to circumvent the younger Mosaic covenant with its legal requirements and has found a way to make both Jews and Gentiles heir to God's covenant blessings. The period between the Abrahamic covenant and Christ is essentially marginalized, so far as universal salvation history is concerned. As part of this process he has identified Jesus Christ as the true heir of Abraham. But he pushes further back: for Paul, Christ is also the second Adam, and the radical identification of all people with their forebear Adam points to an equally radical identification with the second Adam, Christ (Rom 5:12–21; 1Cor 15:21–22, 45–49). This Adamic element is both similar and dissimilar to the *An. Apoc*. The ideal Jacob/Israel in the allegory can easily be regarded as a second Adam, as we have seen, but whereas Paul sees in Christ the redemption of a catastrophically fallen Adam, the Enochic allegorist thinks only in terms of a *resumption* and an *expansion* of the Adamic inheritance. The sin of Adam and Eve is conspicuously missing from the allegory. The *An. Apoc*. is more at home with a theology that stresses the "glory of Adam" than with one that stresses the plight of Adam.[21]

More can be said, but it is clear even from this quick study that a comparison of the *An. Apoc*. and Paul could be a valuable exercise. The *An. Apoc*. provides a historical-theological model that could be useful for illuminating obscure aspects of the theology of Paul, which is currently the subject of intense debate.

4. *Conclusions*

The results of the present study may serve as a point of departure as well as a conclusion. The *An. Apoc*. is a rich literary work that stands to make useful contributions to many ongoing conversations. This chapter has simply identified three such areas and has presented a case for many fruitful interactions as yet unrealized.

[21] See *General Comments* on 85:2–10 (pp. 146–147).

APPENDIX

ALLUSIONS TO THE *ANIMAL APOCALYPSE* IN THE *EPISTLE OF BARNABAS* AND THE COPTIC *APOCALYPSE OF ELIJAH*

Although the reception history of the *An. Apoc.* does not fall within the scope of the present study, careful analysis of some of the early uses of the work can provide useful results for both translation and interpretation. Commentaries have typically dealt with allusions to the *An. Apoc.* in early Jewish and Christian literature by including them in catalogs of quotations and allusions to *1 Enoch*[1] and by making brief mention of them at what are thought to be appropriate places in the body of the commentary proper, often following in the footsteps of August Dillmann.[2] Neither of these approaches allows much space for discussion, and as a result these early allusions remain an underutilized resource. Two texts that repay closer examination are *The Epistle of Barnabas* and the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah*.

1. The Epistle of Barnabas

There is good evidence that the audience of the *Epistle of Barnabas* attached scriptural authority to Enoch's writings. *Barn.* 16:6 loosely quotes *1 En* 91:13, introducing it as scripture ("For it is written," γέγραπται γάρ).[3] In *Barn.* 4:3, the author cites an unnamed source, introduced thus: "Concerning which it is written, as Enoch says." The quoted text is similar to an Ezekiel apocryphon discovered at Qumran (4Q*385* 3 2–6), a text from which ps.-Barnabas appears to draw a second quotation in 12:1 (≈ 4Q*385* 2 9–10), attributed

---

[1] Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, cvi–cxxxix; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, lxx–ciii. Nickelsburg provides by far the most thorough treatment in a regular commentary (*1 Enoch 1*, 71–108).

[2] For example, *T. Levi* 10:5 is briefly mentioned in connection with *1 En* 89:50 in Dillmann's commentary (*Das Buch Henoch*, 263), and this example has been followed by commentators ever since: e.g., Schodde (*Book of Enoch*, 229–230), Martin (*Le livre d'Henoch*, 214), Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 198), Uhlig (*Das äthiopische Henochbuch*, 692); Black (*Book of Enoch*, 269), and Tiller (*A Commentary*, 312).

[3] For this quotation, see Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 132.

there to "another prophet."[4] Perhaps some material originally assigned to Ezekiel came down to ps.-Barnabas under the name of Enoch.[5] But the most important allusion for our purposes appears in *Barn.*16:5, which has been routinely cited since the 19th century as a periphrastic quotation of the *An. Apoc.*[6]

> Πάλιν ὡς ἔμελλεν ἡ πόλις καὶ ὁ ναὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ παραδίδοσθαι, ἐφανερώθη. Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· "Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ παραδώσει Κύριος τὰ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς καὶ τὴν μάνδραν καὶ τὸν πύργον αὐτῶν εἰς καταφθοράν." Καὶ ἐγένετο καθ' ἃ ἐλάλησεν Κύριος.
>
> Again, it was revealed how the city and the temple and the people of Israel would be handed over. For the scripture says: "And it shall be in the last days that the Lord shall hand over the sheep of the pasture and the sheepfold and their tower to destruction." And it happened just as the Lord said.

The quotation seems to reflect most closely *1En* 89:56, referring to the Babylonian conquest ("I saw too that he abandoned their house and their tower, and he gave all of them into the hands of the lions to tear and devour them—into the hands of all the beasts"). But as Milik points out, *Barn.* 16:5 is really a "conglomerate of expressions scattered all over our Enochic writing."[7] It has also been noted that the opening line of the quotation, "And it shall be in the last days," has no counterpart in the *An. Apoc.*, and this has been taken as evidence of a loose approach to source material, or perhaps of textual corruption.[8] In contrast, I would suggest that this line is

---

[4] See Menahem Kirster, "Barnabas 12.1, 4.3 and 4Q Second Ezekiel," *RB* 97 (1990), 63–67; and John C. Reeves, "An Enochic Citation in Barnabas 4.3 and *The Oracles of Hystapes*," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J.C. Reeves & J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 260–277.

[5] A not unheard-of phenomenon. An apocryphal quotation cited often by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus is attributed once to Isaiah (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.20.4) and three times to Jeremiah (Justin, *Dial.* 72.4; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.22.1; *Epid.* 78). Twice it is cited anonymously (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.33.12; 5.31.1). Another apocryphal quotation is attributed to Ezekiel by Tertullian (*Carn. Chr.* 23) and to Jesus by Justin (*Dial.* 47). It is quoted anonymously in four other patristic sources (see *OTP* 1. 494–495).

[6] E.g., Schodde, *Book of Enoch*, 230; Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, cxxiii; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, lxxxi, 199; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 46–47; Black, *Book of Enoch*, 270; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 321–322; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 87. For a full discussion, see James C. VanderKam, *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (ed. J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler; CRINT 3.4; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 37–40.

[7] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 47. See also Tiller, *A Commentary*, 321–322 ("probably a composite quotation taken from various places in the *An. Apoc.* from memory").

[8] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 47; Tiller, *A Commentary*, 321; VanderKam, *Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage*, 39.

the most important key for understanding what ps.-Barnabas is doing. It has escaped all notice that the words are a verbatim quotation of LXX Mic 4:1: Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. The phrase may seem common, and more-or-less equivalent expressions do occur elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 38:16; Isa 2:2), but in fact Mic 4:1 is the only text that provides a perfect fit. Why would ps.-Barnabas quote the opening line of Micah 4, only to lapse into a paraphrase of the *An. Apoc.*?

The sixteenth chapter of the *Epistle of Barnabas* (ca. 70–135)[9] is a sustained argument that the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed in accordance with prophecy and that the true Temple of God is a purely spiritual one, represented by Christian believers. The Septuagint of Micah 4 supplies ammunition for this kind of argument in verse eight: "And you, O dusty tower of the flock, daughter Sion, to you it shall come, and the former dominion, a kingdom out of Babylon, shall enter daughter Ierousalem."[10] Remembering that "Babylon" was sometimes used as code for "Rome" (1Pet 5:13; Rev 14:8; 16:19; 18:2, 21, 22; *Sib. Or.* 5:159), it may be supposed that ps.-Barnabas found in this verse a prophecy of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, since nothing else in Micah 4 appears suitable to his argument. The explicitly eschatological language of the first seven verses would have given ps.-Barnabas justification for reading the prediction of the Babylonian conquest in verse eight with ultimate reference *not* to the events of 587 but rather to an invasion coming "in the last days." The well-known typological connection between the Babylonian and Roman destructions, in vogue at the time the *Epistle of Barnabas* was written, would also have lent credence to such a reading.[11]

Micah 4:8, then, fits well enough into the argument of *Barnabas* 16, and this explains the citation of the oracle's opening line about the last days (i.e., 4:1). But how does ps.-Barnabas get from Micah to Enoch? As it happens, the influence of Mic 4:1–8 can be detected in several places in the *An. Apoc.* What most immediately strikes the eye is the unique reference in verse eight to the "tower of the flock" (מגדל עדר; πύργος ποιμνίου). Very possibly this is

[9] For the date, see Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Second Edition* (transl. J.B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), 160.

[10] Translation from NETS (*A New English Translation of the Septuagint* [ed. A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright; New York: OUP, 2007]). The MT does not supply a foreign invader in v. 8 but only a further prophecy of restored dominion to Zion: "And you, O tower of the flock, hill of daughter Zion, to you it shall come, the former dominion shall come, the sovereignty of daughter Jerusalem" (NRSV). However, the Babylonian exile does appear in v. 10.

[11] This typology is used in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, for example, roughly contemporary with ps.-Barnabas.

the immediate source of an image found several places in the *An. Apoc.* (*1En* 89:50, 56, 66). But other correspondences of a more general nature present themselves as well, several of which have been noted by Tiller:[12]

LXX Micah 4:1–7	*Animal Apocalypse*
1a. And it shall be in the last days, the mountain of the Lord shall be manifest, prepared on the tops of the mountains, and it shall be elevated beyond the hills.	87:3. And they lifted me up to a lofty place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were lower.
1b. And peoples shall hasten to it, 2. and many nations shall come and say: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Iakob, and they will show us his way, and we will walk in his paths." Because out of Sion shall go forth a law, and a word of the Lord from Ierousalem.	90:29. I watched until the Lord of the flock brought out a new house … And all of the flock was within it. 30. And I looked at all the flock that was left, and all the beasts which were on the earth and all the birds of the sky were prostrating and bowing down to the flock, making petition to them, and obedient to them in every matter.
3b. … and nation will no longer lift up sword against nation, and they will learn war no more.	90:34. And I watched until they laid down the sword which had been given to the flock. They returned it to his house and they sealed it up before the face of the Lord.
6. In that day, says the Lord, I will assemble her who is shattered, and I will welcome her who is rejected and those whom I drove away. 7. And I will make her who is shattered a remnant, and her who is driven away a strong nation, and the Lord will reign over them in Mount Sion from now and forever.	90:33. And all who had been destroyed and dispersed, and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky, gathered together in that house, and the Lord of the flock rejoiced with great joy because all of them had become good, and they had returned to his house.

There is nothing here close enough to qualify as a case of borrowing, but the cumulative impression, especially with the striking "tower of the flock" in the mix, is that Mic 4:1–8 may have been one of the eschatological oracles laid under contribution in the overall imaginative construction of the *An. Apoc.* For ps.-Barnabas, however, the direction of influence went in the opposite direction. When he found in Mic 4:8 a prediction of the demise of

[12] Tiller, *A Commentary*, 373. Young S. Chae finds the closest parallel to *En* 90:19 in Mic 4:11–13, and he argues that Mic 2–5 is one of the three prophetic texts (along with Zech 9–11 and Ezek 34–37) that has most influenced the *An. Apoc.* (*Jesus as the Eschatological Shepherd*, 108, 113).

the Temple, the Enochic "quotation" that he also found there ("tower of the flock") may have convinced him that Micah was updating the ancient *An. Apoc*. And indeed, the overall similarities go well beyond the single, isolated image they share.

It may be asked why ps.-Barnabas is bothering with Micah at all, since the *An. Apoc*. supports his argument splendidly on its own. After all, there is no Temple ("tower") in the eschatology of the *An. Apoc*., only the gathered people of God (*1En* 90:28–36), and the same popular typology that allows ps.-Barnabas to interpret the Babylon of Mic 4:8 with reference to the Rome of 70 CE would presumably have given him license to read the Babylonian conquest in *1En* 89:56 (the main source for his *An. Apoc*. quotation) in exactly the same way. But Micah 4:1–8 supplies something that Enoch standing alone does not: *explicit textual warrant* for projecting this Babylonian invasion beyond its sixth century horizon into ps.-Barnabas's time, in the form of the expression, "And it shall be in the last days." In my view, this is the most plausible explanation for the conflate quotation in *Barn*. 16:5, starting with a precise citation of Mic 4:1 and ending with language from the *An. Apoc*., all in the service of proving from "the scriptures" that the physical temple would disappear in order to make way for the congregation of the faithful. For ps.-Barnabas, Micah is simply providing footnotes to the "earlier" prophecy of Enoch, and ps.-Barnabas is so confident of this that he can even put the distinctly Enochic language into Micah's mouth with no apparent qualms.

Once we understand that ps.-Barnabas casts Micah in the role of Enoch's glossator, we are better positioned to understand ps.-Barnabas's treatment of Moses in *Barnabas* 10. Here, ps.-Barnabas argues that the Mosaic legislation in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 regarding clean and unclean animals has nothing to do with literal diet but should be interpreted allegorically with reference to different kinds of human behaviors.[13] But the citations of the Torah in *Barnabas* 10 are puzzling. Some are reasonably accurate quotations or identifiable allusions,[14] while others cannot be identified even loosely with any biblical text.[15] I would suggest that here too, ps.-Barnabas believes he has a biblical author who is taking cues from the *An. Apoc*.

---

[13] This approach to Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14 was not new; it had precedent in *Let. Aris*. 139–171 and in Philo, *Spec. Laws* 4:100–118; *Agr*. 131–145.

[14] *Barn*. 10:1 ≈ Lev 11:7, 10, 13–15; Deut 14:8, 10, 12–14; *Barn*. 10:2 ≈ Deut 4:10, 13; *Barn*. 10:6 ≈ Lev 11:5; *Barn*. 10:11 ≈ Lev 11:3; Deut 14:6.

[15] *Barn*. 10:5 (prohibitions against eating the sea eel, the octopus, and the cuttlefish) and 10:7 (prohibition against eating the hyena).

It has not escaped notice that the people of God in the Enochic allegory are clean animals (cattle, sheep), while the outsiders and the wicked are uniformly unclean. As previously noted, David Bryan's ambitious study of the *An. Apoc*. argues that this clean/unclean distinction is *the* key for understanding the entire work.[16] Without endorsing Bryan's thesis in its entirety, it may be granted that he is correct that this feature would have been obvious to ancient readers coming from a Jewish background. This means that the allegorical approach favored by ps.-Barnabas, which takes the clean and unclean animals of Mosaic legislation as types of people, could be vindicated by pointing out that Enoch had already depicted clean and unclean animals *exactly in this manner*, long before Moses. Since ps.-Barnabas does not openly present this argument, we must be cautious in making the claim; nevertheless, that he followed some such line of thought is suggested by the fact that some of the peculiarities in the "biblical" citations of *Barnabas* 10 can be clarified by referring not to Moses but behind him to the ancient prophet Enoch. Like Micah, Moses is elaborating the *An. Apoc*.

This hypothesis is able to explain, for example, the prohibition against eating hyenas (*Barn*. 10:7), a passage that baffles commentators because it has no biblical or rabbinic basis. But hyenas are explicitly included among the unclean enemies of the Israelite flock in the *An. Apoc*. (*1En* 89:10, 55), so this could well be another example of ps.-Barnabas placing Enochic language in the mouth of the prophet's later interpreter. A clearer example of this phenomenon occurs in the list of four birds of prey in *Barn*. 10:4, presented as a quotation from Moses:

> "Οὔτε φάγῃ τὸν ἀετὸν οὐδὲ τὸν ὀξύπτερον οὐδὲ τὸν ἱκτῖνα οὐδὲ τὸν κόρακα"· οὐ μή, φησίν, κολληθήσῃ οὐδὲ ὁμοιωθήσῃ ἀνθρώποις τοιούτοις.
>
> "Neither shall you eat the eagle, nor the sharp-wing,[17] nor the kite, nor the raven": He is saying that you must not associate with or mimic such men.

---

[16] Bryan, *Cosmos*, chaps 1–7. For problems with Bryan's thesis, see *Introduction* (pp. 8–9).

[17] The two earliest uses of this epithet (Hesiod, *Op*. 212; Homer, *Il* 13:62) both occur in passages that describe a *hyrex* shooting swiftly across the sky and snatching other birds in mid-flight as its prey. That is distinctly the behavior of a falcon, and the falcon is the only large bird of prey with wings that taper to a point. All others (eagles, vultures, kites, hawks, ospreys, etc.) have broad wings ending in a fan-like structure. Whether in ancient or modern times, these high-flying birds have always been distinguished from each other by their silhouettes. Hence, the word ὀξύπτερος does *not* mean "swift-winged," a poetic term for a hawk (as most translators take it), but rather "sharp-winged" or "pointed-winged," an epithet coined in order to distinguish the falcon from other birds loosely grouped with it under the umbrella term, ἱέραξ ("hawk"). In their original edition of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Lightfoot

Ultimately, this list is based on the first six birds of prey mentioned in Lev 11:13–15 // Deut 14:12–14, but the shorter catalog in *Barn.* 10:4 is more immediately similar to a recurring list of birds in the *An. Apoc.* This list first appears in *1En* 89:10, but since the text there is problematic, the next instance (90:2) provides a sturdier basis for comparison.

MT Lv 11:13–15 Dt 14:12–14	LXX Lv 11:13–15 Dt 14:12–14	Ethiopic OT Lv 11:13–15 Dt 14:12–14	*Barn.* 10:4	*1En* 90:2
נשר	ἀετός	**ንስር ፡** (*neser*)	ἀετός	**ንስር ፡** (*neser*)
פרס	γρύψ	**ግሪጳ ፡** (*gerippā*)	}	
עזניה	ἁλιαίετος	**አልያጦን ፡** (*ʾalyāṭon*)	ὀξύπτερος	**አው·ስት ፡** (*ʾawest*)
דאה	γύψ	**ጊጳ ፡** (*gippā*)		
איה	ἴκτινος	**ሆባይ ፡** (*hobay*)	ἴκτινος	**ሆባይ ፡** (*hobay*)
ערב	κόραξ	**ቋዕ ፡** (*qʷāʿ*)	κόραξ	**ቋዕ ፡** (*qʷāʿ*)

Enoch and Barnabas both reduce the Mosaic list from six to four by substituting a foreign term in the second position, replacing the three terms that appear at that point in the Torah. In all other respects, the lists are identical: Reading across the chart from Hebrew to Greek to Ethiopic in the biblical texts, and continuing across the *Barnabas* and *1Enoch* columns, there are no important differences in the avian equivalences in the initial, the penultimate, and the final rows.[18] It is reasonable to suspect that ps.-Barnabas has taken the four birds for his Mosaic quotation from Moses' putative source, the *An. Apoc.*, rather than directly from the Torah. The resultant recovery of the Greek text behind the Ethiopic for these four birds enables us to correctly translate the enigmatic **አው·ስት ፡** as "falcons," going back through ὀξύπτερος to Aramaic דיתא (most likely), rather than translating **አው·ስት ፡** as "vultures," as Dillmann and all others have done.

That there is a relationship between the *An. Apoc.* and the historical narrative of Genesis through Kings is transparent, and there is evidence that

---

and Harmer correctly translate "falcon" in 10:4 (*The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Greek Texts with Introductions and English Translations* [London: Macmillan and Co., 1891], 278); and LSJ recognizes both "sharp-winged" and "falco" as possibilities alongside the more common choices, "swift-winged" and "hawk" (LSJ 1236, s.v. ὀξύ -πτερος and -πτερον).

[18] This is not to say that there are no ambiguities in the *identifications*; only that the ambiguities tend to be common across the languages. Thus, *neser* can mean both "eagle" and "vulture" in both Hebrew and Ethiopic. The penultimate bird on the lists can be a "hawk" or a "kite" in all three languages. The bird in last place can be a "raven" or a "crow" in all three languages.

ancient readers had no difficulty seeing this,[19] but the *Epistle of Barnabas* shows that even more subtle relationships with other kinds of biblical literature, the oracle of Micah 4, for example, or Mosaic legislation concerning clean and unclean animals, was both detected and interpreted. The scrutiny given to the *An. Apoc*. probably stemmed from the conviction that this was scripture, and if the book was indeed put forth as exactly that, we may presume a high level of expectation between the author and his anticipated readership. It follows that if our own interpretation of the *An. Apoc*. hinges at times on connections to the Psalms or the Prophets, there is no reason to think we have uncovered avenues more subtle than what were countenanced within the book's original literary-historical context.

2. *The Coptic* Apocalypse of Elijah

Some scholars have suggested that the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* alludes to portions of *1En* 90:22–27.[20] The passage in question comes near the end of the apocalypse in its surviving form. The fourth-century Coptic version (here represented on the left) is supplemented by a few late third-century Greek fragments:[21]

5:30. On that day, the Lord will judge the heaven and the earth.	
He will judge those who transgressed in heaven,	
and those who did so on earth.	
31. He will judge the *shepherds of the* people.	ποιμένας τοῦ [λαοῦ …
He will ask about *the flock* of sheep,	τὴν νομὴν τ̣[…
and they will be given to him,	
without any deadly *guile* existing in them.	ἄνευ δόλου..[…
32. After these things (Gk: "*when*")	ὅτε
Elijah and Enoch will come down.	Ἠλείας καὶ Ἐν[ὠχ …
They will lay down the flesh *of the wor*ld,	τοῦ κόσμ[ου …
and they will receive their spiritual flesh.	
*They will pur*sue the Son of Lawlessness	κ̣ατα[διώκουσιν …
and kill him since he is not able to speak.	

[19] An interpretation of 89:43–49, found at the end of its citation in a Greek MS (Vat 1809), and marginalia in Ethiopian MSS provide evidence that the Greek and Ethiopian traditions understood well enough the relationship between the *An. Apoc*. and the OT historical narrative. See Tiller, *A Commentary*, 22–23.

[20] Jean Marc Rosenstiehl, *L'Apocalypse d'Élie: introduction, traduction et notes* (Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du judaïsme intertestamentaire, t. 1; Paris: P. Geuthner, 1972), 55 n. 50; Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 47; Black, "The 'Two Witnesses,'" 228–229.

[21] Transl. Wintermute, *OTP* 1. 752. For the dating, cf. *OTP* 1. 729–730. Greek fragments follow Milik's republication (*Books of Enoch*, 47).

The reference to God's judgment upon "the shepherds of the people" concerning "the flock of sheep" does indeed resemble the language of *1 En* 90:22 and 25:

> 22. Then he spoke to that man who had been writing in his presence (who was himself one of those seven white ones), and he said to him: "Seize those seventy shepherds, to whom I delivered the flock, and who, having received them, killed far more than they were commanded."
>
> 25. Then those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty, and they too were cast into that abyss of fire.

Nevertheless, the language of *Apoc. El.* 5:30 is no closer to *1 En* 90:22, 25 than it is to Ezek 34:1–10 and Jer 23:1–2. If this verse were all, the case for an Enochic allusion would be weak. But the judgment of the shepherds in *1 En* 90:22–25 is shortly followed by what appears to be a reference to the return of Enoch and Elijah:

> 31. After this, those three who were clothed in white and had seized me by the hand, they who had brought me up earlier, while the hand of that male sheep was also holding on to me—they lifted me up and set me down in the midst of the flock, unrelated to the judgment that had taken place.

The "male sheep" holding Enoch's hand is probably the same one who was elevated and brought to stay with Enoch earlier in the allegory, where it is plain that the figure is Elijah (89:52). In a similar fashion, the reference to the judgment of the shepherds in *Apoc. El.* 5:30–31 is immediately followed by a reference to Enoch and Elijah's return. The juxtaposition of these two motifs in both works lends support to the claim that the *Apoc. El.* is dependent on the *An. Apoc.*[22]

According to *Apoc. El.* 5:32b Enoch and Elijah exchange their worldly flesh for spiritual flesh and then oppose and kill the "Son of Lawlessness." Does this Antichrist episode also find a reflection in the *An. Apoc.*? A few verses after the return of Enoch and Elijah in *1 En* 90:30–31 comes the crucial paragraph that has figured so heavily in the present study:

> 90:37. And I saw that a certain white bull was born, and its horns were large. And all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the sky were afraid of it and making petition to it at all times. 38. And I watched until all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle. The first one became a *nagar* among them, and that *nagar* became a great beast, and on

[22] Oddly, Rosenstiehl and Milik make no mention of the Enoch/Elijah tradition when they cite *Apoc. El.* 5:30–32 as an allusion to *1 Enoch*, but Black makes careful note of it. See n. 20 above.

its head were large black horns. And the Lord of the flock rejoiced over them and over all of the cattle. 39. And I fell asleep among them, and I awoke; and I saw everything.

Traditional Ethiopian exegesis[23] interprets key elements of this passage as follows:

37: The white bull is Christ.[24]
38a: These transformations are the results of Enoch and Elijah's ministry.[25]
38b: The *nagar* and great beast is the Antichrist, or even the Devil.[26]
38c: The rejoicing of the Lord of the flock (1) "over them" and (2) "over all the cattle" refers to God's satisfaction with (1) the death of a false Enoch and Elijah whom the Antichrist has raised up (his "two horns"), and with (2) the martyrdom of the faithful, which brings reward.[27]
39: The sleeping and awakening are Enoch's death and resurrection.[28]

The struggle with the Antichrist and the martyrdom and subsequent resurrection of Enoch (and Elijah) are typical elements taken from a tradition cluster that is widely-attested in early Christian literature. The traditions usually expand on the "two witnesses" of Rev 11:3–12, who are almost always

---

[23] The main resource here is the *Andemta* (a traditional Ethiopian commentary), which can frequently be corroborated by marginal notes in MSS of *1Enoch*. Daniel Assefa has reproduced and translated most of the relevant portions of two 19th c. copies of the *Andemta* (Assefa, "Enigmatic," 557–558). I have compared Assefa's *Andemta* text with marginalia in 2080 (15th–16th c.) and several 17th–18th c. MSS (2436, 4750, 6974).

[24] *Andemta*: "I saw that Christ was born"; "I saw until the Lord was born from Our Lady" (Assefa, "Enigmatic," 557). *Marginalia* have abbreviations of "Christ" (= **ክርስቶስ ፡**) and "Concerning the coming of Christ" (= **በምጽአት ፡ ክርስቶስ ፡**): **ክርስ** [?] (2080); **ክር** (2436); **በምጽአት ፡ ክርስቶ** (6974).

[25] *Andemta*: "I saw until the side of the faithful was transformed by intellect during the period of Henoch and Elijah"; "The faithful that were instructed by Henoch and Elijah became 'intelligent'" (Assefa, "Enigmatic," 557). *Marginalia* have abbreviations of "Apostles Enoch and Elijah" (= **ሐዋርያት ፡ ሄኖክ ፡ ወኤልያስ ፡**): **ሐዋ ፡ ሄኖ ፡ ኤል** (6974); **ሄኖ … ሐዋ … በመካ …** [?] (2436).

[26] *Andemta*: "The false messiah …"; "The first false messiah, the Devil …" (Assefa, "Enigmatic," 558). *Marginalia* have abbreviations of "The false messiah, or the Devil" (= **ሐሳዌ ፡ መሲሕ ፡ ቦ ፡ ዲያብሎስ ፡**): **ሐሳ ፡ ዲያ** (2080); **ሐሣ** (2436); **ሐሳ ፡ መሲ** (4750); **ሐሳ ፡ መሲ … ቦ ፡ ዲያብሎ** (6974).

[27] *Andemta*: "This despised messiah became a killer. He appointed a false Elijah, a false Enoch …"; "[T]he false messiah, the Devil, became a large beast, that is he became a seducer. He has a false Enoch and a false Elijah who are sinners"; "The lord of the sheep rejoiced over their death and the death of the just"; "The creator of Israel rejoiced much at the death of the false Enoch and the false Elijah. The Lord rejoiced at the death of his faithful for they will be rewarded through it (death)" (Assefa, "Enigmatic," 558). *Marginalia* have abbreviations of "The false Elijah, the false Enoch" (= **ሐሳዌ ፡ ኤልያስ ፡** , **ሐሳዌ ፡ ሄኖክ ፡**): **ሐሳ ፡ ኤ**, **ሐሳ ፡ ሄ** (2080); **ሐሣ ፡ ኢል** (2436).

[28] *Andemta* not translated. *Marginalia* have abbreviations of "Death occurs; resurrection occurs" (= **ሞት ፡ ኮነ ፡ ትንሣኤ ፡ ኮነ ፡**): **ሞት**, **ትንሣ** (4750); **ትንሣ** (2436); 6974 has the phrase in full.

identified as Enoch and Elijah.[29] Viewed in isolation, there would be no reason to relate the particular version of this tale presented in the *Apocalypse of Elijah* to the version presented in Ethiopian exegesis of *1En* 90:37–39, but when their mutual recourse to a well-known constellation of interrelated Antichrist traditions is taken in conjunction with the two preceding correspondences, the emerging alignment is impressive:

Apoc. El. 5:31 = *1En* 90:22, 25	(Judgment on the shepherds of the flock of Israel)
Apoc. El. 5:32a = *1En* 90:31	(Return of Enoch and Elijah in the last days)
Apoc. El. 5:32b = *1En* 90:38b–39	(Enoch and Elijah fight with the Antichrist)

In addition, shortly before the manifestation of the Antichrist in *1En* 90:38, EMML 6974 has a note opposite "all of their species were transformed, and they became all of them white cattle," which reads: **ባሕርየ ፡ ሥጋሆሙ ፡** ("the nature of their flesh"). This has no obvious counterpart in the 19th c. *Andemtas* cited by Assefa. In approximately the same place 2080 has several words, not all of them legible, but **ሥጋ ፡ ወነፍስ ፡** ("flesh and spirit") can be read. It is tempting to compare this marginalia with *Apoc. El.* 5:32, which describes Enoch and Elijah laying down the "flesh of the world" and receiving their "spiritual flesh" in preparation for their combat with the Antichrist.

What value does this have for translating and interpreting the *An. Apoc.*? As argued in Chapter One, an unavoidable issue facing any scholar of this work is the apparent corruption in the text of 90:38b, which reads literally: "The first one became/was a *nagar* ("word," "thing") among them, and that *nagar* became/was a great beast, and on its head were large black horns." Debate about this text has been distorted by the assumption that the *nagar* is the same as the wondrous white bull of verse 37 and is therefore a positive character. At least in the world of the Ethiopian manuscript tradition, this is not so. Whatever originally lay behind *nagar*, there is no evidence that Ethiopian scribes ever saw this character in a positive light or identified it with the messianic white bull of the previous verse.[30] This means that once

[29] Bauckham, "The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah," 447–458; Black, "The 'Two Witnesses'" (cf. n. 20 above), 227–237; Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 213 n. 11.

[30] This is the burden of Assefa's article ("Enigmatic," 557–560), which reinforces a conclusion I reached independently, based upon MS marginalia and conversations with Archbishop Abuna Melkesedek (see Olson, *Enoch, A New Translation*, 23). The *Andemtas* speak of the *nagar* Antichrist as becoming "ridiculous" (**ዋዛ ፡**) and a "killer" (**ገዳይ ፡**), Amharic terms that appear in the marginalia of several MSS opposite 90:38 (2080, 6974, 4750).

discussions of 90:37–38 cross the threshold into the Ethiopic stage of textual transmission, any hypothesis about possible corruptions in the text should take this bias into consideration, but with the exception of Daniel Assefa's article, this has not been done. It might be objected that the thousand year gap between the translation of *1Enoch* into Ethiopic (4th–6th c.)[31] and the earliest recoverable records of traditional Ethiopian exegesis is plenty of time for novel reading traditions to arise. It is here that *Apoc. El.* 5:30–32 makes a singular contribution. If this text really does represent a second or third century Egyptian Christian[32] understanding of the end of the *An. Apoc.*, this would suggest that the interpretation of 90:38 with reference to the Antichrist in the Ethiopian church is no medieval innovation but reflects a Christian exegesis of the book pre-dating its introduction into Ethiopia. There is still room here for more than one hypothesis, but the simplest option would be that the Antichrist interpretation of *1En* 90:38 was introduced into Ethiopia along with the book itself and has remained traditional ever since.

3. *Conclusions*

The Epistle of Barnabas and the *Apocalypse of Elijah* show how seriously the *An. Apoc.* was interpreted in some circles of early Christianity. For the purposes of the present study, they show how well the subtle intertexualities between the *An. Apoc.* and other scriptures were detected and appreciated even by early readers. These early readers also give us occasional help with problems of translation, some of lesser importance (i.e., the identity of the second bird of prey), and some of greater (i.e., the *nagar* of 90:38).

---

[31] See Edward Ullendorff, *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 31–59 (esp. 55–59). In his 39th Festal Letter, Athanasius dismisses the books attributed to Enoch as false and heretical. This *may* indicate that *1Enoch* was translated into Ethiopic near the beginning of the Christianization of the kingdom of Axum (i.e., between ca. 340 and 367).

[32] For the date and provenance, see Wintermute, *OTP* 1. 729–730.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Appian. *Appian's Roman History II*. Translated by Horace White. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912.

Arrian. *The Anabasis of Alexander*. Translated by P.A. Brunt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976–1983.

Beyer, Klaus, ed. *Die Aramäischen Texte vom Totem Meer*. Göttingen: Vandernhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Breitenstein, N., ed. *The Royal Collection of Coins and Medals, Danish National Museum: Volume Two: Thrace and Macedonia*. Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. West Milford: Sunrise Publications, 1982.

Brooke, Alan England, Norman McLean, and Henry ST John Thackeray, eds. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Volume II: The Later Historical Books. Part III. I and II Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Charles, Robert H., ed. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch Edited from Twenty-Three MSS. Together with the Fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.

Diodorus Siculus. *The Library of History*. Translated by C.H. Oldfather et al. Loeb Classical Library. 12 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950–1967.

Dillmann, August, ed. *Biblia Veteris Testamenti Aethiopica*. 5 vols. Leipzig: Societate Germanorum Orientall, 1853–1894.

Ehrman, Bart D., ed. and trans. *Apostolic Fathers: Volume II. Epistle of Barnabas. Papias and Quadratus. Epistle to Diognetus. The Shepherd of Hermas*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Elliger, Karl and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Editio Funditus Renovata*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967/1977.

Flemming, Johannes., ed. *Das Buch Henoch: Äethiopischer Text*. Texte und Untersuchungen n.s. 7.1. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.

Hadas, Moses, ed. and transl. *Aristeas to Philocrates; Letter of Aristeas*. New York: Harper, 1951.

Herdner, A., ed. *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*. Mission de Ras Shamra 10. Paris, 1963.

Herodotus. *Herodotus, with an English Translation*. Translated by A.D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1921–1961.

Hesiod. *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Edited and Translated by Glenn W. Most. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Homer, *The Iliad*. Translated by William F. Wyatt. Revised by A.T. Murray. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924–1925. Revised edition: 1999.

Jacoby, Felix., ed. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1954–1964.

Josephus. *Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

———. *The Jewish Antiquities*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Knibb, Michael A., in consultation with Edward Ullendorf. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Löfgren, Oscar, ed. *Jona, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharja Und Maleachi äthiopisch: Unter Zugrundelegung Des Oxforder Ms. Huntington 625 Nach Mehreren Handschriften Herausgegeben*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1930.

———. *Die Äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel: nach Handschriften in Berlin, Cambridge, Frankfurt am Main, London, Oxford, Paris und Wien zum ersten Male herausgegeben und mit Einleitung und Kommentar versehen*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927.

Marcus Aurelius. *Meditations*. Translated by C.R. Haines. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar., eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Milik, Jozef T., with the collaboration of Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1898. Revised by Kurt Aland et al., 1991.

Newell, E.T., ed. *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch*. Chicago: Obol International, 1914.

Philo. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Plutarch. *Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914–1926.

Polybius. *The Histories*. Translated by W.R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1922–1927.

Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic, Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Secondary Sources

Lexicons and Other Reference Works

Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.

Clines, David J.A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 5 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–2001.

Dalman, Gustaf H., ed. *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. 3d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938.

Dillmann, August. *Ethiopic Grammar, Second Edition Enlarged and Improved*. Translated by J.A. Chrichton. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.

———. *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae cum Indice Latino*. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1865.

Freedman, David N. et al., eds. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Grébaut, Sylvain, ed. *Supplément au Lexicon linguae aethiopicae de August Dillmann (1865) et édition du lexique de Juste d'Urbin (1850–1855)*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1952.

Jastrow, Marcus, ed. *Dictionary of the Targamim, Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. New York: Putnam, 1886–1890. Repr. New York: Judaica Press, 1982.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition*. Translated by M.E.J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Lambdin, Thomas O. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*. Harvard Semitic Studies 24. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1978.

Leslau, Wolf, ed. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden. Otto Harrassowitz, 1991.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon, Revised and Augmented Throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the Assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the Co-operation of Many Scholars, with a Supplement 1968*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1843.

Commentaries, Monographs and Articles

Abel, Félix-Marie. *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Études bibliques. Paris: Librarie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1949.

Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *The Community and Message of Isaiah 56–66*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982.

Adler, William. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989.

Aitken, J.K. Review of Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123/2 (2004): 331–341.

Anderson, Francis I. and David N. Freedman. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.

Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 8. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Assefa, Daniel. *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1Hen 85–90): une propagande militaire? Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 120. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "The Enigmatic End of the Animal Apocalypse in the Light of Traditional Ethiopian Commentary." Pages 552–560 in *Proceedings of the XVth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies*. Edited by Siegbert Uhlig. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.

Barag, Dan P. "The Effects of the Tennes Rebellion on Palestine." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 183 (1966): 6–12.

Barker, Margaret. *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. London: SPCK, 1991.

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

———. *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Bartlett, John R. *1 Maccabees*. Guide to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Bauckham, Richard. "The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95/3 (1976): 447–458.

Bautch, Kelly Coblentz. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen."* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 81. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Beckwith, Roger T. "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1980): 167–202.

Bedenbender, Andreas. *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokcalyptik*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte 8. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000.

Beer, Georg. "Das Buch Henoch." Pages 217–310 in vol. 2 of *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Edited by Emil Kautzsch. 2 vols. Tübingen: Freiburg; Leipzig: Mohr, 1900.

Begg, Christopher. "The Identity of the Three Building Sheep in 1 Enoch 89,72–73." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 64 (1988): 152–156.

Berner, Christoph. *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubliäen: Heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen im Antiken Judentum*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 363. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

Bickerman, Elias. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Translated by Horst R. Moehring. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 32. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Black, Matthew, in consultation with James C. VanderKam, with an appendix on the 'Astronomical' chapters (72–82) by Otto Neugebauer. *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha VII. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

———. "The 'Two Witnesses' of Rev. 11:3 f. in Jewish and Christian Tradition." Pages 227–237 in *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube*. Edited by Ernst Bammel, C.K. Barrett, and W.D. Davies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Borger, Rykle. "Die Beschwörungsserie *Bīt Mēseri* und die Himmelfahrt Henochs." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33 (1974): 183–196.

Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Bringmann, Klaus. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdische-hellenistischen Geschichte (175–163 v. Chr.)* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenshchaften in Göttingen; philologische historische Klasse 3.132. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.

Broshi, Magen, ed. "247. 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pages 187–191 in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea Part 1*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann et al. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 36. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Bruce, Frederick F. *The Book of Acts: Revised Edition*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

———. *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*. London: Tyndale, 1957.

Bryan, David. *Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Campbell, Jr., Edward F. *Shechem II: Portrait of a Hill Country Vale: The Shechem Regional Survey*. American Schools of Oriental Research Archaeological Reports 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. *Shechem III: The Stratigraphy and Architecture of Shechem/Tell Balâṭah: Volume 1: Text*. American Schools of Oriental Research Archaeological Reports Archaeological Reports 6. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2002.

Caquot, André. "Hénoch = 1 Hénoch." Pages 465–625 in *La Bible: Écrits intertestamentaires*. Edited by André Dupont-Sommer and Marc Philonenko. Paris: Gallimand, 1987.

Chae, Young S. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Charles, Robert H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John*. International Critical Commentary. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920.

Charles, Robert H. et al., eds. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.

———. *The Book of Enoch Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text, Emended and Revised in Accordance with Hitherto Uncollated Ethiopic MSS. and with the Gizeh and Other Greek and Latin Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1893.

———. *The Book of Enoch or 1Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited with the Introduction, Notes, and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast, Enlarged, and Rewritten, Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." Pages 216–227 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. "Testaments." Pages 325–331 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

———. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." Pages 111–133 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by George W.E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.

———. "The Sibylline Oracles." Pages 317–472 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Collins, John J. and Gregory E. Sterling, eds. *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001.

Coogan, Michael D. *Stories from Ancient Canaan*. Louisville: Westminster, 1978.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms III, 101–150*. Anchor Bible 17A. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Dancy, John C. *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees*. Blackwell's Theological Texts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954.

Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72 108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 11. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Davies, Philip R. "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28 (1977): 127–140.

Delling, G. "Die Begegnung zwischen Hellenismus und Judentum." Pages 3–39 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 2.20.1 (1987).

De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961.

DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.

Dillmann, August. *Das Buch Henoch übersetzt und erklärt*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1853.

Dimant, Devorah. "4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[a]." Pages 129–172 in *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI Parabiblical Texts, Part 4; Pseudo Prophetic Texts*. Edited by D. Dimant, Partially Based on Earlier Transcriptions by John Strugnell. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

———. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

———. "ההיסטוריה על-פי חזון החיות (חנוך החבשי פה-צ)." מחקרי ירושלים מחשבת ישראל ("History According to the Vision of the Animals [Ethiopic Enoch 85–90]." *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought*) 1, 2 (1982): 18–37.

Doran, Robert. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 12. Washington, DC.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Ego, Beato. "Vergangenheit im Horizont eschatologischer Hoffnung: Die Tiervision (1 Hen 85–90) als Beispiel apolkalyptischer Geschichtskonzeption." Pages 171–195

in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.

———. "The Hellenistic Crisis as Reflected by the *Animal Apocalypse*: Aetiological and Eschatological Aspects." Pages 75–87 in *Judaism and Crisis: Crisis as a Catalyst in Jewish Cultural History*. Edited by Armin Lange, K.F. Diethard Römheld, and Matthias Weigold. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Elliott, Mark Adam. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 18. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987.

Eshel, Esther. "*Jubilees* 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions." Pages 21–36 in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 89. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Eshel, Hanan. "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period." Pages 102–110 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Firmage, Edwin. "ZOOLOGY (FAUNA)." Pages 1109–1167 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

Förster, Werner. "Der Ursprung des Pharisäismus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 34 (1935): 35–51.

Fossum, Jarl. *The Image of the Invisible God: Essays on thenfluence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Fröhlich, Ida. "The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch (*1Enoch 85–90*)." *Review de Qumran* 14 (1990): 629–636.

———. *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Frye, Northrop. "Allegory." Pages 12–15 in *The Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Edited by Alex Preminger. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Fuks, Gideon. "Josephus' Tobiads Again: A Cautionary Note." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 52/2 (2001): 354–356.

Gebhardt, Oscar. "Die 70 Hirten des Buches Henoch und ihre Deutungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Barkochba-Hypotheses." *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* 2.2 (1872): 163–246.

Gera, Dov. *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Gibson, John C.L. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977.

Ginsberg, H.L. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 400–404.

———. "The Tale of Aqhat." Pages 149–155 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to*

the Old Testament. Edited by James. B. Pritchard. 3d ed. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word, 1987.

Goldschmidt, Lazarus. *Das Buch Henoch aus dem Aethiopischen in die ursprünglich hebräische Abfassungssprache zurückübersetzt, mit einer Einleitung und Noten versehen*. Berlin: R. Heinrich, 1892.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. *1 Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 41. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.

———. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

———. "How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic' Promises." Pages 69–96 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period: Volume 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*. Library of Second Temple Studies 47. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

———. "Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography." Pages 43–68 in vol. 2 of *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. 2 vols. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Green, Peter. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Grelot, Pierre. "Hénoch et ses écritures." *Revue Biblique* 92 (1975): 481–500.

Griffith, Guy T. *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.

Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

———. "Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews." Pages 238–274 in *Hellenistic History and Culture*. Edited by Peter Green. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

———. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

———. "Jewish Perspectives on Greek Culture and Ethnicity." Pages 62–93 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Psalmen*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.

Habicht, Christian. *2.Makkabäerbuch*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistische-römischer Zeit 1.3. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976.

Hall, Robert G. *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 6. JSOT Press, Sheffield, 1991.

Hammershaimb, Erling. *De gammelltestamentlige Pseudepigrafer med inledning og noter*. Copenhagen: Gads, 1956.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Harrington, Daniel J. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution*. Old Testament Studies 1. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988.

Harrison, Robert. "Hellenization in Syria-Palestine: The Case of Judea in the Third Century BCE." *Biblical Archaeologist* 57:2 (1994): 98–109.

Hartmann, Louis, and Alexander A. di Lella. *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 23. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1974.

Hengel, Martin, and Daniel P. Bailey. "The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period." Pages 75–146 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Hirschy, Noah C. *Artaxerxes III Ochus and His Reign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1909.

Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Second Edition*. Translated by Joseph B. Lightfoot and J.R. Harmer. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

Hooker, Morna. *The Son of Man in Mark*. London: SPCK, 1967.

Horsley, Richard A. "Social Relations and Social Conflict in the *Epistle of Enoch*." Pages 100–115 in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2000.

Howgego, C. *Ancient History from Coins*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Isaac, Ephraim. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) ENOCH." Pages 5–89 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Jackson, David R. *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 49. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

———. "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism." Unpublished seminar paper. Fourth Enoch Seminar. Camaldoli, Italy, 2007.

Japhet, Sarah. "Conquest and Settlement in Chronicles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98/2 (1979): 205–218.

Kee, Howard C. "TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS." Pages 775–828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Kellermann, Ulrich. "Das Danielbuch und die Märtyrertheologie der Auferstehung." Pages 50–75 in *Die Entstehung der jüdischen Martyrologie*. Edited by J.W. van Henten, B.A.D.M. Dehandschutter, and H.W. Van Der Klaauw. Studia Post Biblica 38. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Kent, Charles Foster. *A History of the Jewish People During the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek Periods*. New York: Scribners, 1904.

King, Philip J. and Lawrence E. Stager. *Life in Biblical Israel*. Library of Ancient Israel. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Kirster, Menahem. "Barnabas 12.1, 4.3 and 4Q Second Ezekiel." *Revue biblique* 97 (1990): 63–67.

Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes. "From Creation to Noah in the Second Dream-Vision of the Ethiopic Enoch." Pages 147–159 in vol. 1 of *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*. Edited by T. Baarda et al. 2 vols. Novum Testamentum Supplements 47–48. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

———. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) BARUCH." Pages 615–652 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Knibb, Michael. "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch." Pages 213–219 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976): 253–272.

———. "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch." Pages 48–64 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. "Which Parts of 1Enoch Were Known to Jubilees? A Note on the Interpretation of Jubilees 4.16–25." Pages 254–262 in *Reading From Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J.A. Clines*. Edited by J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 373. New York: Sheffield Academic, 2003.

Koch, Klaus. "Response to 'The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in 1Enoch.'" Pages 44–55 in vol. 1 of *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. 2 vols. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 80. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. "The Astral Laws as the Basis of Time, Universal History, and the Eschatological Turn in the Astronomical Book and the Animal Apocalypse of 1Enoch." Pages 119–137 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Vor der Wende der Zeiten: Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur*. Gesammelte Aufsätze 3. Neukerchen-Vluyn: Neukierchener Verlag, 1996.

Kugel, James L. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.

———. *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

———. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftlicke Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukerchen-Vluyn: Neukerchener Verlag, 1988.

Lacocque, André. "Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7." Pages 114–131 in vol. 1 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 83.1–2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Launey, Marcel. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*. 2 vols. Bibliothèque des

écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. 1. sér. (in 80) fasc. 169. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1949–1950.

Levine, Lee I. *Judaism & Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* The Samuel & Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies. Seattle & London: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Lightfoot, Joseph B., and J.R. Harmer, eds. *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Greek Texts with Introductions and English Translations*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.

Lindars, Barnabas. "A Bull, a Lamb and a Word: 1 Enoch xc.38." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1976): 483–486.

Lipschits, Oded, and Joseph Blenkinsopp, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the NeoBabylonian Period*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Lunt, H.G. "THE LADDER OF JACOB." Pages 401–411 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

Macomber, William F., and Getatchew Haile. *A Catalog of Ethiopian Manuscripts Microfilmed for the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library, Addis Ababa and for the (Hill) Monastic Manuscript (Microfilm) Library, Collegeville*. 9 vols. Collegeville, MN: Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, 1975–1986.

Martin, François. *Le livre d'Hénoch traduit sur le texte éthiopien*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1906.

Martínez, Florentino García. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Metzger, Bruce M. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Milik, Jozef T. "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân." *Revue biblique* 62 (1955): 398–406.

Milik, Jozef T., with the collaboration of Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Millar, Fergus. "The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's 'Judaism and Hellenism'." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978): 1–21.

———. "The Problem of Hellenistic Syria." Pages 110–133 in *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilizations from Syria to Central Asia after Alexander*. Edited by Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

Mitchell, David C. "Firstborn *Shor* and *Rem*: A Sacrificial Josephite Messiah in *1Enoch* 90.37–38 and Deuteronomy 33.17." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15/3 (2006): 211–228.

Mitford, Terence B. "Ptolemy Macron." Pages 163–187 in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*. Edited by Edoardo Arslan. Milano: Casa editrice Ceschina, 1957.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Daniel*. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner's, 1927.

———. *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect*. Philadelphia: Winston, 1907. Repr., New York: Ktav, 1968.

Muilenburg, James. "MIZPAH, MIZPEH." Pages 4407–409 in vol. 3 of *The Interpreter's*

Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962.

Müller, F. Max, ed. *Sacred Books of the East*. 51 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879–1910.

Müller, Karlheinz. *Studien zur frühjüdischen Apocalyptik*. Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände 11. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991.

Newsom, Carol. "Enoch 83–90: The Historical Résumé as Biblical Exegesis." Unpublished seminar paper. Harvard University, 1975.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

———. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 575–600.

———. "Enochic Wisdom and The Mosaic Torah." Pages 81–94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1981.

———. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005.

———. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity: Expanded Edition*. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 37–82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

Niskanen, Paul. "Daniel's Portrait of Antiochus IV: Echoes of a Persian King." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 378–386.

Olson, Daniel C., in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh. *Enoch: A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch, Translated with Annotations and Cross-References*. North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 2004.

———. "Historical Chronology after the Exile according to 1 Enoch 89–90." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15/1 (2005): 63–74.

———. Review of Daniel Assefa, *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85–90): une propagande militaire? Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques*. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 40 (2009): 76–77.

Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

———. "The Heavenly Counterpart of Moses in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 131–144 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Pardee, Dennis. "THE 'AQHATU LEGEND." Pages 343–356 in *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Edited by William W. Hallo. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Parker, S.B. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 9. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

Pedersen, Johannes. "Zur Erklärung der eschatologischen Visionen Henochs." *Islamica* 2 (1926): 416–429.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Porter, Paul A. *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 20. Uppsala: Gleerup, 1983.

Purvis, James D., and Eric M. Meyers. "Exile and Return: From the Babylonian Destruction to the Reconstruction of the Jewish State." Pages 201–229 in *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple: Revised and Expanded Edition*. Edited by Herschel Shanks. Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1999.

Rajak, Tessa. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 48. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Reese, Günter. *Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentems: eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äethiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 123. Berlin: Philo, 1999.

Reeves, John C. "An Enochic Citation in Barnabas 4.3 and *The Oracles of Hystapes*." Pages 260–277 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves & J. Kampen. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Reicke, Bo. "Official and Pietistic Elements of Jewish Apocalypticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 137–150.

Reid, Stephen B. "1Enoch: The Rising Elite of the Apocalyptic Movement." Pages 147–155 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1983 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent H. Richards. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

———. "The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse and the Book of Dream Visions." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 16/2 (1985): 189–201.

Rosenstiehl, Jean Marc. *L'Apocalypse d'Élie: introduction, traduction et notes*. Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du judaïsme intertestamentaire t. 1. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1972.

Rostovtzeff, Michael. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1941. Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

———. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 285. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Schodde, George H. *The Book of Enoch: Translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes*. Andover: Draper, 1882.

Schreiner, Josef. *Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik: Eine Einführung*. Biblische Handbibliothek 6. Munich: Kosel, 1969.

Schürer, Emil. *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886.

———. *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1874.

———. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135): A New English Version*. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem." Pages 45–56 in *Historical*

Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27–31 January, 1999. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel Schwartz. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 37. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. "Once Again on Tobiad Chronology: Should We Let a Stated Anomaly be Anomalous? A Response to Gideon Fuks." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 53/1 (2002): 146–151.

———. "Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?" Pages 47–61 in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by Martin Goodman. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Schwartz, Joshua. "Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56 (1985): 63–85.

Seltman, C. *Greek Coins: A History of Metallic Currency & Coinage Down to the Fall of the Hellenistic Kingdoms*. London: Spink & Son, 1977.

Sherwin-White, Susan M., and Amélie Kuhrt. *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

Sievers, Joseph. *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

———. "PRAYER OF JOSEPH." Pages 699–714 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

Smith, Robert H. "The Southern Levant in the Hellenistic Period." *Levant* 22 (1990): 123–130.

Stager, Lawrence E. "Jerusalem as Eden." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 26/3 (May/June 2000): 36–47.

———. "Why Were Hundreds of Dogs Buried at Ashkelon?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17/3 (1991): 27–42.

Stern, Ephraim. *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period, 538–332 B.C*. Warminster, UK: Aris and Phillips, 1982.

Stokes, Ryan E. "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, *1Enoch* 14, and the Qumran *Book of Giants* (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15/3 (2008): 340–358.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1Enoch 91–108*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyer, 2007.

———. "203. 4QEnochGiants[a] ar." Pages 8–41 in *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea Part 1*. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann et al. Discoveries in the Judean Desert 36. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

———. "Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 368–386 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 83.1–2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (1Enoch 85–90)." Pages

91–102 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kirsten De Troyer and Armin Lange. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

———. *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Suter, David. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." Pages 415–443 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 47. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.

———. "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of *1 Enoch*." *Henoch* 25 (2003): 167–212.

Tarn, W.W. *Hellenistic Civilization*. 3d ed. Revised by W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1952.

Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1959. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch 85–90*) (*Volumes I and II*). Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1991.

———. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

———. "George Nickelsburg's '1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch: Chapters 1–36; 81–108.'" Pages 365–372 in vol. 2 of *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. 2 vols. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 80. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. "Israel at the Mercy of Demonic Powers: An Enochic Interpretation of Postexilic Imperialism." Pages 113–121 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin J. Wright III and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Tite, Philip L. "Textual and Redactional Aspects of the Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 83–90)." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 31/3 (2001): 106–120.

Torrey, Charles C. "The Messiah Son of Ephraim." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66 (1947): 253–277.

Uhlig, Siegbert. *Das äthiopische Henochbuch*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5.6. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1984.

Ullendorff, Edward. *Ethiopia and the Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1967*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

van den Broek, R. *The Myth of the Phoenix According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*. Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain 24. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

van Vuure, Cis. *Retracing the Aurochs: History, Morphology and Ecology of an Extinct Wild Ox*. Sofia-Moscow: Pensoft Publishers, 2005.

VanderKam, James C. "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature." Pages 33–101 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.4. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

———. *Enoch, A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995.

———. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

———. "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources." Pages 229–251 in vol. 1 of *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 13. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

———. "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 89–109 in *Exile: Old Testament Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. "Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90)." Pages 279–292 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by H. Najman and J.H. Newman. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71." Pages 169–191 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46/3 (1984): 511–523.

———. *The Book of Jubilees*. 2 vols. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511–512. Lovanii: Peeters, 1989.

———. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

———. "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch." Pages 247–262 in *"Working With No Data": Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Edited by David M. Golomb. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

VanderKam, James C., and George W.E. Nickelsburg. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Studia post-biblica 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

———. "The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 159–166 in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at 60*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Weisheit in Israel*. Gütersloh: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.

Weitzman, Steven. "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123/2 (2004): 219–234.

Wenham, Gordon. *Genesis 16–50*. Word Bible Commentary 2. Dallas: Word, 1994.

Werman, Cana. "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13,2 (2006): 229–255.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 12–36: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1985.

Wickham, L.R. "The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men: Genesis VI 2 in Early Christian Exegesis." Pages 135–147 in *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by James Barr; Oudtestamentische Studiën 19. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Widengren, Geo. "Iran and Israel in Parthian Times with Special Regard to the Ethiopic Book of Enoch." *Temenos* 2 (1968): 139–177.

Williamson, H.G.M. *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Wintermute, O.S. "APOCALYPSE OF ELIJAH." Pages 721–753 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Zahn, Molly M. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131/2 (2012): 271–288.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Abel, Félix-Marie, 141n65
Achtemeier, Elizabeth, 49n114
Adler, William, 151n15, 246n6
Aitken, J.K., 240n14, 241
Anderson, Francis I., 48n107
Argall, Randal A., 97n33, 105n
Assefa, Daniel, 10, 12–13, 23–25, 35, 58, 60n13, 68, 71, 236n1, 254nn23–27, 255

Barag, Dan P., 197n13, 198n14
Barker, Margaret, 21n6
Bar-Kochva, Bezalel, 140, 142, 204n37, 239nn8,10
Bartlett, John R., 91n
Bailey, Daniel P., 48n111, 49n113
Bauckham, Richard, 226n, 255n29
Bautch, Kelly Coblentz, 57n1
Beckwith, Roger T., 101n44
Bedenbender, Andreas, 12–13, 20n3, 171n
Beer, Georg, 22, 26n29, 52n, 122, 138n55, 139n57
Begg, Christopher, 199n19
Berner, Christoph, 11, 12nn35–36, 53n128, 101n44, 102n45, 216n
Beyer, Klaus, 40n79, 123, 157
Bickerman, Elias, 88n10, 219–220, 238
Black, Matthew, 22, 27n33, 29n42, 41n83, 51n117, 59n10, 100n40, 103n51, 124, 128n25, 131, 132n38, 135n46, 137n51, 138n55, 141nn62–63, 158n29, 159n33, 160n34, 185n76, 191n5, 204n36, 209, 212n54, 224n74, 226n, 230n83, 231, 245n2, 246n6, 252n20, 253n, 255n29
Blenkinsopp, Joseph, 195n
Boccaccini, Gabriele, 11, 26n29, 33n53, 84n80
Borger, Rykle, 52n120
Breitenstein, N., 138n55
Briant, Pierre, 198nn16,18
Bringmann, Klaus, 238n8
Broshi, Magen, 106
Bruce, Frederick F., 102n47, 198n15
Bryan, David, 8–9, 53n127, 59, 64n, 92n21, 103n51, 124, 131n34, 132n41, 137n50, 138n55, 139n57, 191n5, 204n36, 216n, 250
Campbell, Jr., Edward F., 204n33
Caquot, André, 53n128
Chae, Young S., 26n29, 92n21, 191n3, 248n
Charles, Robert H., 6n7, 22–24, 26, 32–33, 34nn56,58, 35n59, 41, 51n117, 52n122, 53n123, 63n18, 77n66, 85n2, 86n3, 93n22, 100n40, 101n43, 103n51, 108n63, 117n11, 118, 127n25, 129, 131n34, 132n41, 137n50, 138n55, 139n57, 141n62, 154n23, 155, 158n29, 174–175, 184, 185n76, 189, 191n5, 197n12, 209, 212n55, 215–216, 223n72, 224n74, 227n, 245nn1–2, 246n6
Collins, John J., 30n42, 44nn91–92, 46n98, 51n117, 89n15, 103nn50–51, 138n54, 162n38, 213nn58–59, 240n16
Coogan, Michael D., 127n22

Dahood, Mitchell, 128n26
Danby, Herbert, 64n22
Davidson, Maxwell J., 20n1
Delling, G., 240n16
De Vaux, Roland, 39n73
di Lella, Alexander A., 138n54
Dillmann, August, 20n1, 22, 24, 26n29, 33n51, 51n117, 52n122, 59n10, 67n35, 77n66, 85n1, 121, 122n, 123–128, 132n41, 138n55, 139n57, 141n62, 146, 155n, 156, 158n29, 164, 187n80, 192n, 196, 209nn44–45, 222n67, 230, 245, 251
Dimant, Devorah, 12, 35, 101n44, 102nn46,48, 103n51, 104n53, 191n5, 236n1
Doran, Robert, 239n9
Douglas, Mary, 8

Ego, Beato, 10, 20n2, 29n41, 30n45, 32n47, 59n10, 66, 67n36, 71, 100n39, 101n40, 185n76
Eissfeldt, Otto, 200n25
Elliott, Mark Adam, 20n1, 25n25, 224
Endres, John C., 95n27
Eshel, Esther, 41nn81,85
Eshel, Hanan, 102nn46,49

Firmage, Edwin, 127nn22–23
Fishbane, Michael, 100n36
Förster, Werner, 68

Fossum, Jarl, 46n100
Freedman, David N., 48n107
Fröhlich, Ida, 20n1, 28n38, 29n39, 101n44
Frye, Northrop, 2
Fuks, Gideon, 205n41

Gera, Dov, 207n, 239n8
Gibson, John C.L., 127n22
Ginsberg, H.L., 49n113
Goldingay, John E., 138n54
Goldschmidt, Lazarus, 22, 24
Goldstein, Jonathan A., 26n29, 53n127, 86n2, 89n15, 92n21, 110, 136n49, 138n55, 141nn63,65, 182n68, 204n37, 213n59, 217n, 239
Grabbe, Lester L., 100n37, 197n13, 198n14, 206n
Green, Peter, 203n30, 213n58, 239n8
Greenfield, Jonas C., 41n81
Grelot, Pierre, 108n63
Griffith, Guy T., 203n30, 238n8
Gruen, Erich S., 203n30, 205n40, 213n58, 239n8, 240n16, 241n18
Gunkel, Hermann, 128n26

Habicht, Christian, 141n65
Hall, Robert G., 191n5
Hammershaimb, Erling, 22, 23n10
Hanson, Paul D., 49n114
Harrington, Daniel J., 239n8
Hartmann, Louis, 138n54
Hengel, Martin, 9n21, 48n111, 49n113, 50n116, 53, 88n10, 100n39, 132n38, 191n5, 203n30, 204n32, 213n58, 219–220, 238, 240n14
Hirschy, Noah C., 198nn14–15
Holmes, Michael W., 247n9
Hooker, Morna, 22n8
Horsley, Richard A., 105–106n55
Howgego, C., 138n55

Isaac, Ephraim, 118n18, 196

Jackson, David R., 20n2
Japhet, Sarah, 61

Kee, Howard C., 21n7
Kellermann, Ulrich, 49n116
Kent, Charles Foster, 197n12
King, Philip J., 206n
Kirster, Menahem, 246n4
Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, 28n39, 63n19, 78n69, 93–94
Knibb, Michael, 22, 26n29, 27n32, 33n53, 46n98, 101n44, 103n51, 108, 109n63, 116n, 117–118, 151, 172n55, 193
Koch, Klaus, 29n41, 30, 148, 191n5
Kugel, James L., 45n94, 46n100, 51, 52n121
Kuhrt, Amélie, 139n55, 142n72
Kvanvig, Helge S., 44n91, 51n117, 103n51

Lacocque, André, 27n33, 29n41, 30n45
Launey, Marcel, 141n64
Levine, Lee I., 240nn13,15
Lightfoot, Joseph B., 247n9, 250n17
Lindars, Barnabas, 22–25
Lipschits, Oded, 195n

Martin, François, 6n7, 22, 26n29, 67n35, 101n43, 127n25, 131n34, 132n38, 136nn47,49, 138n55, 139n57, 141n62, 158n29, 159, 185n76, 212n55, 216, 245nn1–2, 246n6
Martínez, Florentino García, 27n33, 33n53, 35n59, 44n91, 85n2, 103n51, 106n58
Metzger, Bruce M., 239n10
Meyers, Eric M., 197n11, 204n34
Milik, Jozef T., 22, 27n33, 31n46, 33nn53,55, 38n68, 40, 44n91, 47n106, 60n14, 85n2, 106, 108n3, 110n66, 125n15, 135, 137n50, 148, 152n18, 157, 164, 174, 212n55, 216, 246, 252nn20–21, 253n22
Millar, Fergus, 88n10
Mitchell, David C., 13, 22, 25, 230
Mitford, Terence B., 142n66
Montgomery, James A., 48n108, 49n113, 101n43, 103n51, 138n54
Muilenburg, James, 182n68
Müller, F. Max, 148n8
Müller, Karlheinz, 12–13, 20n3, 100n39

Newell, E.T., 138n55
Newsom, Carol, 4n5, 33n51, 53n128, 66, 67n36, 70, 72–73, 76, 101n44, 131, 147n, 154n22, 163, 190n3, 236n2
Nickelsburg, George W.E., 7–8, 9n21, 10–11, 13, 21, 23–24, 25n28, 26n31, 28–29, 30n45, 31n47, 32–33, 34n57, 38–40, 42, 43–44n91, 46n98, 49n113, 53n127, 54n129, 57n1, 58–59, 63n21, 66, 67n36, 72nn50,52,55, 76n, 78n66, 82, 86n2, 87, 89n12, 92n21, 93–95, 103n51, 108–109n63, 110, 116–119, 122–123, 128n25, 129, 130n32, 131–132, 134, 135n46, 137, 138n55, 147n, 148n4, 149n12, 152nn16,18, 154nn21–23, 156–157, 161, 163, 169n, 174–175, 176–180, 182n69, 184,

185n76, 188, 191–193, 199, 211n50, 214n61, 216, 222–223, 225, 227n, 230, 242n, 245n1, 246n6
Niskanen, Paul, 240nn11–12

Olson, Daniel C., 7n12, 8, 9n21, 10, 12, 23, 33n53, 42n87, 43–44n91, 48n108, 59n7, 86n8, 103n51, 104n53, 115n1, 117, 128n25, 135n46, 157n27, 160n34, 178n, 223n72, 255nn29–30
Orlov, Andrei A., 46n99, 96n, 128n27

Pardee, Dennis, 127n22
Pedersen, Johannes, 27n33
Porter, Paul A., 137n53
Purvis, James D., 197n11, 204n34

Rajak, Tessa, 241
Reese, Günter, 9–13, 20n3, 21, 32, 35n60, 53, 58n4, 66, 67n35, 70n44, 84n81, 92n21, 100nn39–40, 149n11, 162n41, 168n, 169n, 170n50, 171n, 182n68, 191n5, 192n, 212n56, 216
Reeves, John C., 246n4
Reicke, Bo, 6n8, 85n1
Reid, Stephen B., 28n38, 100n38, 190n1, 191n3
Rosenstiehl, Jean Marc, 252n20, 253n

Sacchi, Paolo, 26n29, 43n91, 141n63, 205n41
Schodde, George H., 6n7, 20n1, 53n128, 67n35, 100n40, 101n43, 131n34, 132n38, 137n51, 138n55, 155n, 158n29, 187n80, 204n36, 212n55, 245n2, 246n6
Schreiner, Josef, 138n55, 139n57, 204n36
Schürer, Emil, 85n2, 101
Schwartz, Daniel R., 141n63, 205n41, 213n59
Schwartz, Joshua, 41n85
Sherwin-White, Susan M., 139n55, 142n72
Sievers, Joseph, 92n20
Smith, Mark, 127n22
Smith, Jonathan Z., 46n99, 47, 74nn60–61
Smith, Robert H., 203, 204n33
Stager, Lawrence E., 21n6, 206n
Stern, Ephraim, 197n11
Stokes, Ryan E., 29n42
Stone, Michael E., 41n81
Stuckenbruck, Loren T., 11, 29, 30nn42–43, 32, 43nn89–91, 45n95, 59n10, 72n50, 172n54, 245n3
Suter, David, 34n57, 38nn66–68, 39–40, 41n85

Tarn, W.W., 203n30, 238n8
Tcherikover, Victor, 88n10, 89nn13,15, 106n55, 142n68, 202n27, 203n30, 207n, 213, 214n60, 238
Theisohn, Johannes, 46n98
Tiller, Patrick A., 2, 5–9, 13, 23–25, 27–28, 29n41, 31n46, 35n59, 53–54, 59nn10–11, 61n16, 63n21, 65–67, 70, 72n50, 73n55, 78nn66–67, 85nn1–2, 86n3, 88, 89n12, 90, 100n38, 101nn41,44, 102n48, 103n51, 109n63, 115–118, 122–123, 125n14, 126n20, 129–130, 132, 134, 135n46, 137nn49,51, 138n55, 139, 146, 147n, 148nn4–5, 149, 152n16, 153–154, 156–158, 160, 161n36, 162nn38,41, 164, 167n46, 169n, 172, 174–179, 180n64, 182, 185nn74,76, 186n, 188n, 189, 190n1, 191n5, 193–195, 199, 203, 204n37, 208–209, 211–212, 214n61, 215–216, 221–222, 223n72, 225–226, 227n, 230, 239n9, 245n2, 246nn6–8, 248, 252n19
Tite, Philip L., 9n21, 11, 35n59, 84n82, 100n38, 148n4, 176n58, 190n1
Torrey, Charles C., 23–24

Uhlig, Siegbert, 13n40, 22, 46n98, 116n, 117–118, 132n41, 141n62, 154n21, 245n2
Ullendorff, Edward, 256n31

van den Broek, R., 128n28
van Vuure, Cis, 230
VanderKam, James C., 29, 32n50, 33nn51,53, 34n57, 40, 43n88, 44n91, 45n97, 46nn98–99, 48n110, 51n117, 52n120, 66, 68, 71–74, 82n77, 85n2, 108n62, 109nn63–64, 115n2, 132n39, 137nn49–50, 190n3, 191n5, 246nn6,8
Vermes, Geza, 46n99, 85n2, 89n14, 99n35, 142n68, 198n14, 202nn26–27, 204n37, 207n, 238n8
Von Rad, Gerhard, 9n22

Weitzman, Steven, 240nn11–12
Wenham, Gordon, 40n75
Werman, Cana, 102n49
Westermann, Claus, 40n75
Wickham, L.R., 151n15
Widengren, Geo, 22
Williamson, H.G.M., 109n63
Wintermute, O.S., 252n21, 256n32
Wright, Benjamin G., 237n4

Zahn, Molly M., 99n35

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE AND OTHER ANCIENT WRITINGS

Old Testament

Genesis
2:7 148
4:3–5 147
4:17–24 149n13
4:25 149
5:3–4 149
5:4 149n13
5:6–8 149n13
5:9–32 149n13
5:32 163n
6:1–4 8, 93–94, 151n14
6:4 135–136
6:9 163n
7:13 163n
9:18 163n
9:25–27 163n
12:2–3 35
12:3 34, 55
12:13–16 34
13:15–17 35
15:5 34, 35
15:7 35
15:18–21 35
16:12 35
17:2–8 35
18:7–8 154n24
18:18 55, 149
22:17–18 35
22:18 31, 55, 149
25:7 53
25:26 31
26:2–4 35
26:4 31, 55, 149
27:14 31
28:3–4 35
28:10–22 37, 39, 40
28:12 52
28:13–14 55
28:13–15 35
28:17–19 41
29:3 196
31:1 69
32:22–30 40n76
32:22–32 37
32:24–32 47, 73
32:28 54
32:28–29 48
32:31–32 48
35:9–15 37, 42
35:11 55
35:28 53
39:9–15 39
41:56–57 168
45:13 69
47:9 53
47:28 53
49:1–2 44–45, 52
49:6 69
50:26 53
Exodus
1:22 170
2:2–25 36
2:24–25 170
3:1–12:36 170
3:7 170
3:8 172
4:11 82n78
4:21 170
7:3–5 170
9:12 170
10:1–2, 20, 27 170
12:12 170
14:4,8 170
14:31 68
15:22 68, 175
15:22–16:36 68
15:23–24 68
15:25–26 68, 70
16:3 68
16:4–10 73, 75
16:4–12 68–69
17:8 175
19–24 70
19:3 68

19:11 68n38
19:27 174
20:18–19 177
20:18, 21 174
24:9–10 68n38
24:16–17 69n41
32:11–14 187n79
32:26–29 59
32:30–34 187n79
33:18–23 70
40:34–38 69n41
Leviticus
9:2 154
9:23 69n41
11:3, 5, 7, 10, 13–15 249n14
11:5 124
11:13–15 126, 251
12:6 6
26:31–35, 43 99
Numbers
1–2 177
6:25–26 172
14:10, 22 69n41
14:13–19 187n79
15:8–9 154n24
16:19, 42 69n41
20:6 69n41
21:33 175
24:15–16 72n51
25:11–13 39
Deuteronomy
5:23–26 177
5:24 69n41
14:6, 8, 10 249n14
14:7 124
14:12–14 126, 251
28:49 126n21
28:62 208
30:3–8 223n72
31:17–18 172
33 45n93
34:7 53
32:8 110n65, 191n4
33:17 13n41, 26n30
Joshua
23–24 45n93
24:2–13 3n5
24:29 53
Judges
17–18 39
18:30 39
20–21 182
1 Samuel
2:1 26n30
5:21–22 181n65
6:21–7:6 181n65
7:3–6 180
7:5 187n79
7:6–14 182
10:17–27 182
12 45n93
12:17–18 187n79
14:32 154
14:48 202
17:43 135
17:44–45 206n
24:4 (LXX) 196
31:1–6 204
2 Samuel
10:6 136
10:8 136
14:47 136
20:18 38
1 Kings
2:1–9:1 45n93
11:23 136
12:29–33 39
14:6–16 39
15:20 38
15:16–18 185n76
15:22 182
2 Kings
12:17–18 185n76
16 186
16:7–8 91, 185
18–19 133
20:12–19 135
21 185n76
23:31–35 133
24:1–2 132, 185n77
24:2 130–131
24:10–13 133, 185n77
24:14 194n9
25 185n77
25:1, 9 133
25:11, 21, 26 195n9
25:23, 25 182
25:27–30 99
1 Chronicles
10:1 185n75
16:8–36 60
17:7 196
28–29 45n93

2 Chronicles
13:2 185n75
16:4 38
16:6 182
36:21 99, 194n9
36:22 104n53
Ezra
1:1 104n53
3:12 200
4:24–5:2,14–16 104
Nehemiah
4:3 135
9 3n5
Job
38:4–11 161
39:27 125–126n17
Psalms
4:6 172
8:4 30n44
8:7 30n44
8:8 30n44
22:16 9n18
31:16 172
44:3 172
44:11 201
48 62n
59:6 9n18
59:14 9n18
67:1 172
75:10 26n30
78 3n5
79 100
80:1–3 172
80:13 9n18
87 21, 223n72, 226, 229
89:15 172
89:17 26n30
90:8 172
92:10 26n30
96:1–13 60
103:5 128n26
104:2–9 161
104:18 [103:19] 124
105 3n5, 176
105:1–15 60
105:16 168
106 3n5, 176
106:1 60
106:24 223
106:44 209
106:47–48 60
112:9 26n30
114:4, 6 154
119:18 72n54
119:35 172
132:17 26n30
136 3n5
137:7 134
148:14 26n30
Proverbs
30:17 207
30:26 124
Isaiah
1:26 223n72
2:2 247
2:2–3 223n72
2:4–6 69
3:7 145
4:3 223n72
8:16–17 172
9:12 205
14:1–2 223n72
14:21 185n75
17:2 196
34:15 126n21
38:14 124
40:2 100, 108n61
41:8 49
41:8–9 48n111
42:1 48n111, 49
42:2 145
42:25 185n75
43:10 48n111
44:1–2 48n111
45:4 48n111, 49
47:5–6 135, 186
49:1–6 49
49:7 48n111
49:19–22 223n72
52–53 49
52:13 49
52:14 48n111
53:11 48n111
54:8 172
54:11–12 223n72
55–56 49
56:11 190
59:2 172
60:1–22 223n72
60:10 226
61:5 226
62:3–5 223n72
63:17 48n111
64:4 9n18

65:7 190
65:8–9 48n111
65:13–15, 22 48n111
65:19 223n72
66:1 200
66:3 9n18
66:12 223n72
66:14 48n111
66:19–21 223n72
66:24 223n71
Jeremiah
8:7 124
15:1–4 187
16:18 100
23:1–2 201, 253
23:1–4 110n65, 190
25:1 104n53
25:3 12
25:11 99
25:11–12, 14 191
25:12 12
25:34–36 190
29:10 99
31:15 147
36:29 194n9
48:40 126n21
49:19 223n71
49:22 126n21
50:6 190
Lamentations
1:1–4 194n9
4:21–22 134
Ezekiel
1:1 40n76
1:26–28 70n43
2:1 157
9:3–4 70n43
18 194
23:11–15 134
23:20 134n
23:23–25 134, 194
23:33 194
25:12–14 134
34 110n65, 190
34:1–10 253
34:5 201
34:11–13, 16 223n72
35 134
36:37–38 223n72
37 224
37:24–28 223n72
38–39 62n
38:16 247
39:23–29 172
40:2 157
40:2–48:35 223n72
Daniel
1:1–2 104n53
1–6 194
7–9 137n53
7:9 29, 51
7:9–12 223
7:10 29, 51
7:11–12 29
7:12–14 30n44
7:13 48, 50, 51
7:13–14 29
7:14 49
7:18 30n44
7:23–27 142
7:25 107
7:27 30n44, 49
8–11 42
8:2 40n76
8:8 137–138
8:14 107
8:21–22 137–138, 140
9:24–27 99, 102, 107
9:26 89n12
9:27 219
10:4 40n76
10:13, 20–21 191n4, 218
11–12 49
11:4 137–138
11:4–6 140
11:21–39 240n12
11:30 219
11:33 49
12:3 49, 218
12:7 107
Hosea
10:15 39
12:3–4 37
12:4–5 48n107
13:7 136
Amos
3:13–14 39
8:14 39
Obadiah
10–16 134
Micah
4:1 157
4:1–8 223n72, 247–248

Micah (*cont.*)
4:8 196
4:11–13 248n
Zephaniah
3:17 223n72
Haggai
1:1–2, 15 104
2:1–2 104
2:2–4 194n9
2:3 200
2:7–9 223n72
Zechariah
1:15 100
2:6–13 194n9, 223n72
4:10 200
6:9–15 194n9
8:2–8 194n9
8:3 157
8:7, 23 223n72
10:3 190
10:10 223n72
11 110n65
11:4–7 190
14 62n
14:5 223n71
14:16 226
Malachi
1 95n30
1:7, 12 199n22
4:5–6 58

Apocrypha

Tobit
12:15 200n23
Judith
2:4 200n25
5 3n5
5:10 168
12:11 200n25
Wisdom of Solomon
4:10–5:5 226n
10–11 237
Sirach
17:17 191n4
44–50 236
44:16 97
44:18, 20 237
45:2 159n31
45:6–7 237
45:7 26n30
45:23–24 237
48:10 58n7
49:14 97
49:16 146n1
50:25–26 204
Baruch
2:13 208
Prayer of Azariah
14 208
1 Maccabees
1:1–7 140
1:11, 43, 52 219
1:29–40 140
1:52–53 219
2:1 91
2:16 219
2:42 5, 92, 214
3:1–2 214
3–5 137n50
3:10 141n62, 143
3:10–26 214
3:13 143
3:13–25 214
3:24 204
3:26–27 143, 218
3:38–4:27 214
3:41 204
3:41–47 182
4:2 143
4:12 143
4:22 204
4:26 143
4:26–27 143, 218
4:29–34 216
4:36–39 96
5:1–68 143
5:4–5 161
5:39 141n62, 219
5:43–44 216
5:62 91
5:66–68 204
6:21 143, 219
6:21–22 143
6:28–29 143
6:29 141, 142
6:38–39 143n
7:12–14 5, 92, 106n55
7:39 143

7:39–46 218
7:39–50 5, 217
10:70–11:4 204
2 Maccabees
3 220n66
3:24–36 218
4:29 141, 143
4:30–36 89n12
5:1–4 218
5:5–16 186
5:22–26 140, 143
5:24–26 186
6:1–9 88n10, 96
8:1–7 214
8:5–36 214
8:8 143, 218
8:9 141n62
10:12–13 142
10:14–15 143
10:14–38 137n50
10:29–30 218
10:32–36 161
11:1–4 143
11:6–10 217
11:6–12 216
11:8 218
11:24 88n10
12:2 141
12:10 219
12:10–45 137n50
12:22 216, 217
12:35 140
13:2 141
13:3 219
14:6 5
15:15–17 5, 91, 217
1 Esdras
2:18–20 104
2:30 104
3–4 194
4:43–50 199
4:45 134
4:63 199
6:1–2 199
6:1–22 104

New Testament

Matthew
11:14 58n7
13:3–23, 47–50 2
17:10–13 58n7
24:22 107n
Mark
7:26–27 206n
9:9–13 226n
9:11–13 58n7
13:20 107n
Luke
1:17 58n7
John
1:1, 4 24
1:21 58n7
Acts
7:11 168
Romans
4:11–12, 16 242
5:12–21 146n1, 243
1 Corinthians
2:8 70n43
10:32 242
12:13 242
15:21–22 146n1, 243
15:45–49 146n1, 243
2 Corinthians
5:17 242
Galatians
3:6–9 242
3:16–18 242
3:28 242
3:29 242
6:15 242
Ephesians
2:15–18; 3:6 242
Colossians
1:7 193
3:11 242
Hebrews
11 237n3
1 Peter
5:13 247
1 John
3:10–12 149n12
Revelation
11:2–12 58n7, 254
14:8 247
16:19 247
18:2, 21, 22 247

Pseudepigrapha

Apocalypse of Elijah
1:3 70n43
5:30 226n
5:30–32 252–256
Apocalypse of Moses
3:3 147n
2 Baruch
4:1–6 157n28
17:3 146n1
20:1 107n
36–40 3n5
53–74 3n5
54:1 107n
72:4 63n19
83:1, 6 107n
1 Enoch (excludes passages discussed chronologically in the course of the running commentary)
1:2 72, 98
1:4 224
3:1 89n13, 125, 165
4:2 89n13
6–9 8
6–16 42, 152
6:6 7
7:2 135–136
7:4 152n18
8:1–2 152
8:4 152n18
9:1 47n105
9:2 41n82
9:2, 10 40
9:3–4 200
9:32 45
10:1 47n106
10:1–3 159
10:1–12 40, 157
10:2–3 163
10:3, 16 33
10:4–5 153
10:6 222n70
10:17–19 223
12–16 39, 222n10
12–19 41n84
12:3–16:4 37
12:4 40
13:4–7 187
13:7 38, 41
13:7–8 40
13:9 38, 42n87
14:5 40
14:8 50
14:18–23 29–30, 51, 200
14:20 73
15:1–2 187
15:3 40, 155
15:12 89n13
17:2 224
17:14 50
18:8 224
18:11–16 222n70
19:3 98
21:6–10 222n70
22:5–7 146
22:14 70n43
24–25 229
24:1–26:6 223
24–26, 32 21, 145
25:1–6 224
25:3 70n43
27:1–2 222n70
27:3, 5 70n43
32:2 193
32:6 146
36:4 70n43
38:1 96n
40:3 70n43
40:7 200
40:9 47
41:2 96n
45:1 96n
46–48 50
46:8 96n
48:6 46
51:3 46
53:6 93n32
54:6 47
56:6 36n64
60:3 159
62:2 46, 47
62:5 46
62:8 96n
63:2 70n43
65:6–11 152n18
65:11–12 163
67:1–3 163
67:2 158
67:3 34, 36n64, 170

67:13 41n84
69:29 46, 47
71:8–13 47, 48
71:14 46, 96n
71:15 36
72:1 98
75:3 70n43
79:6 98
80:2 107
81:1–2 42–43, 52
81:1–5 43n91
81:1–6 45
81:5–6 42–43
82:1–3 36, 98
83:2 229n
83:8 70n43
84:6 34
85:1 147–148
85:2 97
85:3 129, 229n
85:3–6 76
85:3–8 28n39
85:3–89:10 19
85:4 90
85:5 149n13
85:6–7 90
85:8 93, 149
85:8–10 76
85:9 28n39, 78n67, 149n13, 154n20
85:10 149n13
85:10–86:2 116
86:1 28
86:1–3 116, 153
86:1–87:1 94
86–88 52
86:2 72, 78, 93
86:3 43n91, 91
86:4 134n, 135–136
86:5 10n27, 152
87:1 152
87:1–3 116
87:2 28, 76
87:3 248
87:3–4 52
88:1 28, 153
88:2 77
88:3–89:6 116
89:1 78n67
89:1–6 115
89:7–16 116
89:9 28, 76, 129, 149
89:9–10 29n39
89:10 28n37, 63, 64, 118, 123–124, 137–139, 148, 250
89:10–12 31, 52, 90, 121–143
89:10–13 165
89:11–12 74
89:11–14 116, 129
89:12 36, 54, 76, 77, 123–129
89:13–27 142n67
89:14 91, 123
89:15 36n64, 178n15
89:15–16 88
89:16 36
89:17–18 94
89:18 59, 95
89:21 66, 70, 72
89:21–27 64–65, 69, 87
89:21–31 73
89:22 70
89:25 72
89:26 70, 72
89:26–30 116
89:27 123
89:28 58, 66, 69, 72, 82, 87, 91
89:28–29 66–68
89:28–38 94
89:29 57
89:29–31 70, 116
89:30–31 75
89:31 59, 95
89:31–37 115, 116
89:32 57n2, 65, 66, 72, 82n75, 91, 94
89:32–33 71, 77–78, 80, 82
89:32–35 59
89:33 65, 66, 82n75
89:33–35 92
89:34–35 71
89:35 59, 72, 78, 79, 80, 95
89:36 59
89:37 59, 91, 95
89:38 91
89:39 91
89:41 28, 59n11, 65, 66, 71, 72, 75, 79, 80, 82, 91
89:41–49 58
89:42 91
89:42–43 123–124
89:42–50 26–27, 115–116
89:43 10n27

1Enoch (*cont.*)
89:43–44 116
89:43–49 130–131
89:44 59n11, 44, 71, 72, 75
89:44–46 79
89:45 72, 91
89:46 91
89:46–50 95
89:48 91
89:48–49 10n27, 123–124
89:50 59, 75, 95
89:51 71, 72
89:51–52 59n11
89:51–53 58, 79, 80
89:51–54 80
89:52–53 92
89:54 59, 65, 66, 71, 82, 87, 90
89:54–58 131–135
89:54–65 130–131
89:55 91, 142n67, 250
89:56 59, 246
89:57 88, 118n15
89:59 28, 100
89:59–64 100
89:59–90:19 8, 11, 109
89:61 58
89:61–64 83n
89:63 118
89:65 100
89:65–67 131–135
89:65–72 103–104
89:66 123–124
89:68 100
89:69 58, 88
89:71–72 104n54
89:72 87, 100, 123–124, 137
89:72–73 103–104
89:72–90:1 103–104
89:73 59, 89, 95
89:74 65, 66, 72, 82n74, 83n, 87
89:74–90:5 3n4
89:75 118n15
89:76 88
89:76–90:1 104n54
90:1 100
90:1–5 103–104
90:2 10n27, 72, 87, 126n20, 139, 251
90:2–4 137
90:2–16 139
90:2–19 137–138
90:3 88
90:4 136, 139
90:5 100, 104n54
90:6 36, 66, 72, 73n55, 76, 77, 80, 82, 150
90:6–7 62, 89, 147
90:6–8 88
90:6–10 75, 90
90:6–12 58
90:6–19 103–104
90:6–20 86
90:7 59n9, 65, 82n75
90:8 59n9, 77, 89
90:8–12 3
90:8–13 76
90:9 6n8, 66, 72, 85, 118n15
90:9–16 10n27
90:9–18 88
90:10 66, 72, 118n15
90:10–11 85n1
90:10–16 167n47
90:11 126n20, 141
90:11–16 142
90:11–19 141, 172
90:12 85
90:13 126n20, 139, 143
90:13–16 60, 137, 141
90:13–19 28, 62, 64
90:13–38 19, 142
90:15 65, 87
90:16 9n21, 126n20, 147, 154
90:17 104n54, 107, 118n16, 129
90:18 65, 87
90:18–19 12, 137
90:20 29, 100
90:20–27 28, 30, 61, 62, 223n72
90:20–29 63
90:21 134n
90:21–22 76, 77
90:21–24 153
90:22 29, 58
90:22–27 252–256
90:25 29, 223n71
90:26 66, 72, 87, 223n71
90:27 223n71
90:28 28n37
90:28–29 79
90:29 80, 157, 248
90:30 30, 253
90:30–33 63

90:31 13, 52, 59, 60, 76, 77, 253
90:32 76, 150
90:32–35 77, 80, 82
90:33 21, 61, 248
90:33–38 62
90:34 248
90:35 63, 66, 72
90:37 28n37
90:37–38 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19–31, 54, 77, 172, 253
90:40–42 88
91:1–3 44–45
91–93 3n5
91:3 36
91:13 245
92:1 109
92:1–3 52
93:1–10 + 91:11–17 12n36, 31, 42, 102n48, 106
93:2 36, 43n89, 109
93:2, 5, 10 32, 36
93:6 36n64, 176n57
93:10 33
94:1 36
96:2 124, 126n20
102:3 70n43
103:2 43n89
103:9 208
104:12–13 33
105:1–2 36
106:19–107:1 43n89, 45, 159n31, 163

2 Enoch
12:1–3; 15:1; 19:6 128

Exagoge (Ezekiel the Tragedian)
70–76 159n31

4 Ezra
3:21 146n1
4:26 107n
6:26 58n7
14:11–39 3n5

Jubilees
1:13 172
1:26–29 43n90
4:7 147n
4:16–26 97
4:17–24 109
4:19 95, 229n79
4:29 108–109
7:22 135
15:3 191n3
15:31–32 109–110
19:15–31 167n45
24:28–33 204
32:21 42–43, 45, 51, 52n121
32:23 42–43

The Ladder of Jacob
1:1–8 46n100
3 47n107, 51n119
3–4 52n121

The Letter of Aristeas
12–13, 19–23 203n32
139–171 249n13
146 207

Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (Ps.-Philo)
9:2 170n51
19:13 107n
48:1 226n

The Prayer of Joseph
frag. A 47, 74
frag. B 43n89, 45
frag. C 43n89, 47

Psalms of Solomon
8:11–13 95n30

Sibylline Oracles
1:217–241 162n38
4 103
5:159 247

Testament of Moses
2–10 3n5

Hebrew Testament of Naphtali
8:3–6 191n4

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
T. Dan 5:12 21
T. Levi 2:3 38n68
T. Levi 2–7 42
T. Levi 5:1 41n80
T. Levi 16–17 102

Dead Sea Scrolls

CD i 3 172
CD i 5–6 102n47
CD ii 8 172
CD ii 14–iii 12 237
CD iii 18–20 146n1
CD iv 17 199n21
CD v 6–8 199n21
CD v–vii 95n30

CD vi 11–13 199n21
CD-A i 9–10 102n47
CD-B xx 13–15 102n47
1QapGen ii 159n31
1QH xvii 15–16 146n1
1QH[a] xiv 16 229
1QH[a] xvi 4–27 229
1QIsa[a] 48n111
1QM 107
1QM i 1–5 206n
1QM ix 14–16 51n119
1QM xvii 6 218
1QpHab ix 4–6; xii 7–10 95n30
1QS iv 23 146n1
4QDeut[j] 191n4
4Q*180–181* 102n48
4Q*201* 1 iv 10 41n82
4Q*202* 1 iii 7 47n104, 51n119
4Q*204* 110n66
4Q*204* 1 vi 4 40n76
4Q*204* 4 116
4Q*204* 4 7 200n24
4Q*204* 4 8 79n70
4Q*204* 4 10 174
4Q*205* 160
4Q*205* 2 116
4Q*205* 2 i 24 164
4Q*205* 2 i 25, 28 129
4Q*205* 2 i 26 123, 167, 209
4Q*205* 2 iii 28 123
4Q*205* 2 iii 29 167, 209
4Q*205* 2 iii 30 179, 183
4Q*206* 160
4Q*206* 4 116
4Q*206* 4 ii 17 123
4Q*206* 4 iii 14 123
4Q*206* 4 iii 17b–18, 20 174
4Q*206* 5 ii 10 165
4Q*206* 5 ii 11 164
4Q*206* 5 ii 12 31
4Q*206* 5 ii 12–13 167
4Q*206* 5 ii 15 129
4Q*206* 5 ii 16 209
4Q*206* 5 iii 17 82n77
4Q*207* 1 116
4Q*211* 1 i 4–6 165
4Q*213*[a] 1 ii 13 38
4Q*213*[a] 1 ii 18 40
4Q*243* 102n48
4Q*377* 1 ii 10–12 159n31
4Q*385* 2 9–10 245
4Q*385* 3 107n
4Q*385* 3 2–6 245
4Q*387*[a] 3 ii–iii 172
4Q*389* 1 ii 4–5 172
4Q*390* 102
4Q*390* 1 9–10 172n54
4Q*394* (4QMMT) 95n30
4Q*394* 3–7 ii 16–17 177n59
4Q*394* 8 iv 9–10 177n59
4Q*462* i 13–14 206n
4Q*504* 8 i 4 75n62
4Q*521* 2 iii 58n7
4Q*530* ii 16–20 172n54
4Q*530* 2 15b–20 29n42
4Q*537* 43n89, 45
4Q*552–553* 103
11Q*13* ii 6–8 102

Targums and Rabbinics

Targum Neofiti
Gen 28:12 46n100
Gen 32:25 51n119
Gen 32:35 47n107
Targum Onqelos
Gen 28:13, 16 74n59
Lev 11:16 124
Deut 14:15 124
1 Sam 15:18 183n
Isa 38:14 124
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Gen 4:1 149n12
Gen 7:11 191n4
Gen 28:12 46n100
Gen 28:13, 16 74n59
Fragment Targum
Gen 28:12 46n100
Talmud, Mishnah, Midrash Rabbah, Pirqe Rabbi Eleazar
b. Hul. 91b 46n100
m. Hul. 9:2 64–65n22, 124
m. Shebi 8:1 64–65n22
Gen R. 24:6 149n12
Gen R. 68:12 46n100
Gen R. 78:3 46n100
Gen R. 82:2 46n100

Exod R. 52:4 158n30
Num R. 4:1 46n100
Qoh R. on Gen 3:15 146n2
Pirqe R. El. 21 149n12
Pirqe R. El. 35 46n100
Pirqe R. El. 37 47n107

Patristics

Athanasius, *39th Festal Letter* 256n31
Epiphanius, *Pan.* 40.5.3 149n12
Epistle of Barnabas
4:3 107n, 245
10:1, 2, 6, 11 249n14
10:4 126, 250, 251
10:5 249n15
10:7 250
12:1 245
16:5 246
16:6 245
Irenaeus
Epid 78 246n5
Haer 3.20.4 246n5
Haer 4.22.1 246n5
Haer 4.33.12 246n5
Haer 5.31.1 246n5
Justin Martyr
Dial. 47 246n5
Dial. 72:4 246n5
Dial. 145 47n107
Sulpitius Severus, *Chron.* 2:14–16 200n25
Tertullian, *Carn. Chr.* 23 246n5

Gnostic Texts

Gos. Phil. 61:5–10 149n12
Hyp. Arch. 91:20–21 149n10
Orig. World 117 149n12

Josephus

Against Apion
1:186–189 (Hecateus of Abdera) 203n32
1:194 (Hecateus of Abdera) 198n14
1:194–195 (Hecateus of Abdera) 203n28
1:209–211 (Agatharchides of Cnidus) 203n32
Antiquities of the Jews
12.3–7, 25–29, 129–130 203n32
12.154–236 205–207
12.156 204n33
12.168 204n33
12.180 141n63
12.252 219
12.263 88n10
12.293 142
13.171 81n73
Jewish War
2.162–163 81n73
5.460–461 142

Philo of Alexandria

Agr. 131–145 249n13
Creation 136–150 146n1
Praem. 57–58 166n
Spec. Laws 4:100–118 249n13

Graeco-Roman Authors

Appian, *Syr* 50 203n32
Curtius Rufus 4.8.9 202n26
Diodorus Siculus, *History*
16.44.4 198n17
16.47.4 200n25
17.5.3 200n25
19.93.1 204n35
19.100.4 204n35
31.19.2–3 200n25
40.3.8 (Hecateus of Abdera) 203n30
Herodotus, *Hist*. 2:73 128n26
Hesiod, *Op.* 212 250n17
Homer, *Il.* 13:62 250n17
Marc. Aurelius, *Med.* 12:14 81n73
Plutarch, *Dem* 5:2 203n32
Polybius
16:22 207
27:13 142
30:25:3–5 140–141
30:25:5 143

Cuneiform and Mesopotamian Sources

CTA 1.2 iv (*Baal Cycle*) 127
CTA 1.18 iv (*The Legend of Aqhat*) 126–127
Gilgamesh xi 9–10 162n39
Gilgamesh xi 196–197 162n39
Gilgamesh xi 205–206 162n39
Sumerian Flood Story vi 254–256, 259–260 162n40
The Babyloniaca of Berossus (Jacoby FHC iii C. 380, 402) 162n40

Zoroastrian Sources

Bundahishn 14 148
Bundahishn 15 148
Selections of Zadspuran 2:6 148

SUBJECT INDEX

Aaron, 4, 26n20, 59, 69, 91, 95, 170, 174, 176
Abel, 76, 90, 146, 147, 149, 152, 166
Abel-Mayin, 38, 41, 42n87
Abraham, 1–2, 20, 28–29n39, 31, 32, 35, 52, 53, 60, 74–75, 77, 90, 110, 121, 149, 165–167, 242–243
Abrahamic Covenant, 4, 14–15, 31–36, 50, 55, 57, 83, 92, 97, 165, 170, 175, 222, 242–243
Adam, 1, 3, 6, 19, 20, 27, 28–29n39, 52, 77, 93, 94, 146–149
  "Glory of Adam", 75n62, 146, 243
  Second Adam, 12, 27–31, 74, 242, 243
  Adamic Nature/State, 6, 19, 31, 54, 74, 96, 146, 149, 229, 242, 243
Adasa, 5, 217–218
"Admonitions (or Epistle) of Enoch, The", 31, 33, 36, 44–45, 70n43, 105n, 228n
Ahaz, 90, 185–188
Alexander the Great, 103n51, 104n53, 137, 139, 140–142, 202, 241
Allegory (literary genre), 2–3
Amalek, Amalekites, 129, 130, 175
Ammon, Ammonites, 129, 130, 133, 135, 137n50
Anatolia, Anatolians 129, 138–139, 140–141
Andemta (traditional Ethiopian commentary), 254nn23–28, 255
Angels, Archangels (*see also* Shepherds, Watchers), 7–8, 10, 11, 28, 40, 41, 42–43, 46, 47, 48, 51n119, 52, 62, 74, 76, 77, 83, 91, 93n24, 99n34, 101, 109, 131, 157–158, 171, 200, 218, 235, 237
Antichrist, 13, 23–24, 253–256
Antigonus III, 136n49, 139, 204n35, 211
Antiochus II, 140
Antiochus III the Great, 104n53, 139
Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 88, 92, 140, 142, 212, 213, 239
"Apocalypse of Weeks" (1 *En* 93:1–10; 91:11–17), 12n36, 31–33, 42, 45n95, 106, 109n63
Arabs, 219
Aramaic Levi, 38n68, 40–42
Ark (Noah's), 158, 167
Ark of the Covenant, 39, 42n87, 181n65
Artaxerxes III Ochus, 197, 198, 200
Asael, 91, 151–153, 176, 224
Ascalon, 206n42, 207
Assyria, Assyrians, 129–136, 184–186, 188, 194
"Astronomy Book, the", 42–43, 45n95, 98, 109, 165
Auditor (heavenly), 100, 131, 190, 218
Aurochs (wild ox), 13n41, 230
Authority, 14, 62, 97–98, 105–106, 110, 224, 245

Babylon, Babylonians, 1, 99, 100, 103–104, 129–136, 138, 184, 185–186, 190, 194, 197–198, 201, 240, 246–247, 249
Bethel, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 51, 52, 55, 74n59, 148, 157
Beth-zur, 216
Bickerman, Elias, 88n10, 219, 220, 238
Bird(s), 2, 10n27, 19, 21, 25, 54, 62–65, 76, 80, 87, 121, 163–165, 187, 202, 207, 214n60, 215, 217, 220, 225, 228, 229, 241, 248, 250–251
  Translation issues, 124–129
  Allegorical symbolism, 136–143
Black, blackness, 1, 2, 19, 54–55, 76–77, 78, 93, 94, 128, 129, 145, 147, 149, 150, 153, 160, 163, 166, 228–230
Blindness, 4, 7, 10, 62, 64–66, 70–72, 73n56, 75, 77–83, 87, 130, 168, 171, 173, 176, 177, 180, 181, 183, 186, 197, 200, 207–209, 210–212, 219–222, 224, 236
Boar(s), 31, 64n22, 77, 121–123, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 163, 165–166, 178, 192, 194, 195, 199, 202
"Book of the Watchers, the", 29n42, 33, 34n58, 36, 37, 42, 47, 50, 51n117, 70n63, 98, 109, 110n66, 135n46, 146, 151, 152, 153, 155, 157, 165, 187n79, 200, 222–224
Bovines (*see* Bulls, Calves, Cattle, Cows, Heifers)
Bull(s) (*see also* Cattle), 1, 6, 28–29, 31, 53, 76n, 78n68, 121, 129, 145, 147–150, 154n24, 155–156, 158, 160, 162–165, 167, 209n45, 230
  Eschatological White Bull, 2, 6, 12–13, 20, 22–31, 54, 61, 74, 172n54, 228–229, 243, 254–255

Cain, Cainites, 76, 78, 90, 93, 94, 146, 147, 149, 151–153, 166
Calf, calves, 31n46, 53, 78, 93, 121, 145, 149, 150, 153, 163, 164, 167
Camels, 135–136, 150, 152, 154, 155, 156, 159, 162
Carnaim, 216
Cattle (*see also* Bulls), 1, 2, 6, 9, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27–29, 31, 52–55, 60, 63, 74, 76–78, 93, 94, 145, 148, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 159, 162, 166, 167, 228, 229, 242–243, 250, 254–255
Cattle Enclosures, 159, 161
Chaos (*see* "Kosher Mentality")
Clean (*see* "Kosher Mentality")
Color Symbolism, 1, 4, 36, 54n131, 58, 75, 76–78, 80, 81, 128, 149–150, 153, 166, 210, 227
Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah*, 24, 245, 252–256
Cow(s), 145, 150, 152
Crying Out to God, 88, 171, 211, 220
Cyprus, Cypriots, 141–142

Dan , 37–42
Darius, 104
Darkness, 65–66, 82, 155, 156, 159, 160, 162, 219
David, Davidic Dynasty, 4, 10n27, 26, 27, 58, 79, 91, 92, 95, 180, 181–182
Davidic Messiah, 26, 31, 58n6, 91, 167
Day of the Lord, 60, 142
Demetrius Poliorcetes, 136n49, 141, 204n35
Demons, 6, 8, 82, 93–94, 149n12, 152
Determinism, 5, 10, 11, 58, 76, 78, 80, 81, 153, 166, 171, 191
Deuteronomic Theology, 7–8, 58
Diplomacy, Diplomatic Tone, 14, 90, 92–96, 152, 182, 223
Dogs, 9n18, 121–123, 129, 130, 135, 137, 139, 163, 177–178, 187, 201, 202, 204–207
Donkeys, Wild, 53, 121, 122, 129, 130, 135, 136, 150, 152, 154–156, 159, 162, 163, 165, 166, 168, 215–216, 219
Double Identity, Heavenly Double, 37, 46, 47, 50, 52, 74, 96n
"Dream Visions, Book of", 1, 34–35, 36, 109n63
Dream(s), 1, 9n21, 11, 34, 37, 38, 46n100, 50, 52, 84, 109n63, 145, 147, 148, 157, 160, 229, 230, 231, 240n12

Eagles, 87, 121, 122, 125–129, 136n49, 137, 138, 139, 142–143, 163, 164, 201, 202, 204, 206, 207, 208, 214, 215, 218, 219, 250, 251n18
Eden, Edenic Existence, 21, 60, 62, 63, 64, 83, 146, 157, 223, 229
Edna, 145, 148, 229n
Edom, Edomites, 64n, 129–130, 134, 137, 194, 199
Egypt, Egyptians, 59n11, 60, 64, 67, 69, 91, 129–130, 133, 134, 137n50, 138, 139, 141, 142, 168, 169, 170, 171, 184n72, 197–198, 203n32, 205–207, 213, 214n60
Elephants, 135, 136, 150, 152, 154, 155, 156, 159, 162
Elijah, 52, 58, 80, 92, 130, 131, 186, 210, 226, 252–255
Elioud, 135
Enochians, 31, 32, 33n51, 35–37, 92, 94, 96n32, 97, 105, 182, 223
Epistle of Barnabas, 245–252, 256
Esau, 31, 53, 76, 77, 130, 165, 166n
Essenes, 81n73
Ethiopian Reading Traditions, 12–13, 23, 24, 117, 125n15, 127–128, 130n31, 136nn47–48, 148, 219, 252n19, 254–256
Eve, 93, 146, 147, 243
Evil, 1, 6, 11, 33, 55n, 101, 147, 152, 226
Exile, 62, 83n, 99, 102, 103n51, 104, 106, 109, 130, 172, 191, 194, 199, 201, 247n10
Exodus (event), 1, 35, 60, 69, 70, 88, 94, 95, 106, 171–172, 219, 220
Eyes, Eyesight, "Open Eyes", 36, 58, 62, 63–73, 75–83, 86n8, 87, 130, 168, 173, 176–182, 208, 209, 210–212, 214, 220, 224, 225, 227–229, 235–236

Falcons, 121, 122, 124, 125–127, 129, 137, 139–141, 143, 163, 164, 201, 207, 208, 214, 215, 218, 219, 250n17, 251
First Maccabees, 3, 91, 137n50, 143, 204, 213n59, 217–220, 239, 240
Flood, 1, 8, 9n21, 19, 28, 62, 74, 93, 121, 152–154, 157–159, 161–164
Foxes, 121, 122, 124, 129–130, 132, 133, 135, 163, 177, 178, 183, 188, 202
Fratricide, 90, 146, 187

Gabriel, 47, 48
"Gate(s) of Heaven", 37, 40, 41
Gaza, 207
Genealogies, 76, 149–150
Giant(s), 37, 41, 135, 152n18, 155, 162

"Giants, Book of the", 29n42, 110n66, 172n54
Gibborim, 135, 136
Glory, 46–47, 51, 69, 71, 73–74, 79, 178–179, 181, 183, 200n23
"Glory of God" (*see* "Seeing the Glory of God")
Gog and Magog, 62n17
Golden Calf, 59n11, 78, 80, 176
Greece, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142

Ham, Hamites, 76, 163
Hasidim, 5, 92, 106n55, 213n16, 214
Hasmoneans(s), 6n8, 12, 91, 213n59
Heaven(s), 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44n92, 46n100, 50, 51, 68, 91, 98, 107, 135, 137, 152n18, 155, 171, 172n54, 223, 224, 252
Heavenly Double (*see* Double Identity)
Heifer(s), 93, 145, 149
Heilsgeschichte (*see also* Salvation), 4, 9, 92, 175
Heliodorus, 220n66
Hellenism, Hellenization, 86, 87, 89, 128, 136, 137, 139, 140, 201–202, 207, 212, 219–220, 235, 238–240
Hengel, Martin, 9n21, 53, 88n10, 219, 220, 238
Hezekiah, 27, 133, 135
History of Israel, Significance of, 4, 14, 61
Horn, Symbolic Significance of, 10n27, 12, 13, 26, 54, 88, 211, 230
House, 7, 19, 21, 48, 59n10, 62, 63, 71, 79, 80, 94, 130, 131, 133, 173, 174, 177–180, 183, 185, 192, 194, 195, 221, 225, 226, 227, 246, 248
House of David (*see* David)
Hyena(s), 121, 122, 123, 129, 130, 133, 135, 136, 163, 183, 188, 249n15, 250
Hyrax(es), 63–64, 121, 122, 124, 125, 163
Hyrcanus (John), 6n8, 85n1
Hyrcanus (son of Joseph the Tobiad), 205–206

Incubation, 40, 148, 229, 230
Isaac, 1, 2, 14, 31, 35, 36, 41, 52, 53, 54, 60, 74, 75, 77, 90, 121, 165, 166, 167
Isaianic Servant, 48, 49, 96
Ishmael, Ishmaelites, 53, 121, 129, 130, 135, 165, 166, 219
Israel "A Man Seeing God", 73–74
Israel as an Angel, 37, 47–50, 74–75
Istrael (angel name), 47

Jacob, 1, 14, 35–37, 40–55, 57, 60, 61, 63n19, 69, 72–75, 77–78, 83, 90, 91, 96, 148, 157, 165–168, 176, 182, 229, 235, 236, 242–243
  Idealized, "True" Jacob, 14, 31, 47, 54–55, 74, 182, 222
  Jacob Paralleled with Enoch, 37, 40–52, 72–75, 96
Japheth, 76, 149, 163
Jason of Cyrene, 218, 239
Jehoiakim, 132, 134
Jeremiah, 12n36, 91, 98, 99, 107, 184n73, 187, 191, 217, 246n5
Jeroboam, 39
Jerusalem, 7, 39, 42, 79, 80, 95, 104n53, 105, 131–134, 140, 141, 147, 177, 180, 184, 194, 195, 199, 204, 212–213, 218, 236, 238, 247
Jerusalem, New, 2, 19, 21, 26, 52, 59n10, 60, 62, 63, 64, 77, 157, 167, 222, 223, 226, 227, 229, 236
John Hyrcanus (*see* Hyrcanus, John)
Joseph (son of Jacob), 26n30, 53, 59n11, 60, 69, 90, 165, 166
Joseph (son of Tobias), 205–207
Joshua son of Jozadak, 103, 198
Joshua son of Nun, 53, 175
Josiah, 27, 133
Jubilees, Book of, 42, 43nn90–91, 95, 97, 108–110
Judah, 35, 91, 132–135, 184, 185, 186, 188, 192
Judas Maccabee, 5, 8, 59, 60, 85, 86, 88, 91, 92, 96, 138, 140–143, 161, 165, 167n47, 171, 182, 204, 210, 211, 212, 214, 216–218, 220, 224, 239
Judges, 59n11, 79, 130, 180
Judgment, Last (*see* Last Judgment)

Kites, 121, 122, 125, 127, 129, 136n49, 137–139, 141, 143, 163, 164, 201, 204, 206, 207, 208, 214, 215, 218, 219, 250n17
"Kosher Mentality" (Clean and Unclean), 1, 8–9, 59n12, 63, 64, 124, 249, 250, 252

Ladder of Jacob, 46n100, 51
Lamb(s) (*see also* Sheep), 22–25, 54–55, 62, 66–67, 74, 79, 91, 163, 164, 168, 173, 174, 176–180, 182, 183, 195, 198, 199, 207, 214, 221, 224, 228–230
  = Latter-Day Reformers, 36, 77, 88–89, 208–212
Last Judgment, 1, 10, 14, 19, 26, 28–30, 32, 57–62, 64, 66, 77, 83, 87, 88, 101, 108–109, 153, 167, 221–226, 236, 253

Law, 10, 57, 58, 68, 70–73, 86n8, 174, 175, 177, 236
Leadership, 79, 80, 90, 91–92, 94, 153, 168, 176–177, 180–182, 186–187, 210, 224
Leopards, 121, 122, 129–136, 163, 183–184, 188, 192, 194
Levi, Levites, 39, 41, 59, 69, 95, 176, 200n24
Lions, 121, 122, 129–136, 163, 183, 187, 188, 192, 194, 246
Lord of the flock, 1, 19, 20, 21, 25, 35, 55, 61–67, 70, 71, 79, 80, 130, 131, 168–169, 172–174, 177–179, 181, 183, 185, 187, 192, 195, 215, 217, 221, 223, 225, 228, 229, 248, 254

Maccabean Era, 51, 77, 86, 88, 92, 182, 204, 211, 213
Maccabean Revolt, 1, 3, 5, 8, 14, 19, 28, 32n47, 60, 62, 86, 89, 90, 96, 98, 99, 103n51, 105, 107, 110, 137–138, 140–142, 154, 161, 214, 219, 220, 235, 236, 238, 241
Macedonia, Macedonians, 87, 104nn53–54, 129, 137–139, 142–143, 201–202, 204, 207
Male Sheep (*dabēlāt; see also* Ram), 60, 143, 208–212, 214, 215, 218, 224–225, 253
Manasseh, 8, 103n51, 131, 185n76
Marah, 67, 68, 70
Maskilim, 49
Men, White (angels), 1, 76, 155, 157, 221
Menelaus, 186
Mesopotamia, Mesopotamian Literature, 159, 162, 163
Messiah, 12, 13, 25, 26–27, 45, 242, 254
Methuselah, 44, 97, 145, 229n
Michael, 47, 48, 218
Midian, Midianites, 129, 130
Mizpah, 180–182
Moab, Moabites, 129, 130, 133
Moral Freedom and Responsibility, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 80, 81, 84, 153, 191, 235
Moses, 4, 10, 43n90, 53, 59, 60, 67–71, 78, 80, 91, 92, 94, 126, 158–159, 170, 174, 176, 177, 182, 186, 187, 200n24, 210, 237, 249, 250, 251
Mount Hermon, 37, 40, 41, 42
Mount Sinai, 58, 67–69, 70–71, 73, 75, 78, 175
Mysia, 140, 212n54

nagar (Ethiopic word), 12, 13, 19, 22–25, 253–256
Nationalism, 4, 6, 54, 60–61, 166, 242
Nebuchadnezzar, 132–133, 134, 185n77, 186, 192, 200n25
Nehemiah, 104n52, 199
Nephilim, 135–136
Nicanor of Cyprus 141
Nicanor (Seleucid general), 218
Noachic literature, 34, 170
Noah, 6, 27–29, 33–35, 45n95, 76, 77–78, 101, 121, 152n18, 154, 157–163, 165, 177

Ochus (*see* Artaxerxes III)
Onias III, 59n9, 88, 89, 212, 238
Open Eyes (*see* Eyes, Eyesight)
Ox, Wild Ox (*see* Aurochs)

Palestine, 122, 139, 142, 198, 203–207
"Parables of Enoch", 34, 36, 41n84, 45–48, 50, 51n117, 55, 74, 96n, 158–159, 170, 200
Parables of Jesus, 2–3
Paradise, 21, 146, 157
Paul the Apostle, 235, 242–243
Persia, Persians, Persian Era, 1, 3, 41, 99, 100, 103, 104, 136n48, 190, 196–198, 201, 204n33, 206n42, 211
Phanuel, 48
Philip (governor of Jerusalem), 140, 212n54
Philip II, 104n53
Philistines, 129, 130, 135, 137, 139n56, 182, 204–207
Philo of Alexandria, 45n94, 74, 166n, 249n13
Phinehas, 39, 42n87
Phoenix(es), 63n20, 121, 122, 125, 127–128, 163–164
Phrygia, 140, 212n54
Pig(s), 9n18, 123
Plant (symbol), 32–36
Prayer of Joseph, 46n99, 47, 55, 74–75
Prayer(s), 34, 35, 171, 182, 187
Priest, Priesthood, 39, 41, 59, 89, 91, 92, 96, 199n21, 211, 212, 236, 238
Propaganda, 5, 90, 98, 142, 203, 239n9
Prophets, 4, 39, 55, 58, 59, 60, 79, 80, 91, 92, 130, 132, 133, 184, 186, 210, 246, 250
Ptolemaic Era, 3n4, 41n85, 103, 104, 129, 190, 201, 203, 205, 208
Ptolemaic Greeks, 129, 137n51, 138n55, 139, 140, 141, 203, 204, 207
Ptolemy I, 136n49, 139, 203n32, 205
Ptolemy II, 140
Ptolemy Macron, 142

Ram(s), Ram of the Flock (*see also* Male Sheep), 6n8, 25, 26, 36, 54, 60n14, 77, 79, 86, 141, 163, 164, 167, 168, 171, 178–180, 182, 204, 209–210, 214

Raphael, 47–48, 200n23
Ravens, 76, 77, 87, 88, 121, 122, 126, 128, 129, 137–139, 143, 163, 164, 201, 207, 208, 212, 214, 215, 218, 219, 250–251
Red, Redness, 1, 2, 19, 54, 76, 145, 149, 160, 163, 229
Red Sea, 64–67, 171
Reform, Reformers, 59n11, 89, 106n55, 147, 210–212, 220, 224
Rewritten Scripture, 99

Salvation (*see also Heilsgeschichte*), 3, 4, 6, 7, 9–11, 14, 19–22, 34, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 64, 75, 83, 87, 102, 110, 146, 158, 175, 191, 224, 228, 235, 237, 243
Samaria, Samaritans, 48n108, 64n, 129, 202n26, 204n33
Samuel, 26, 27, 79, 80, 91, 95, 179, 180–183, 186, 187, 210, 236
Sariel, 33, 46n99, 47, 51n119, 157
Saul, 26, 59n11, 79, 91, 167, 180–183, 202, 204
Scribe(s), 105–106, 117, 255
Second Maccabees, 89, 91, 143, 213n59, 214, 217, 218, 239, 240
"Seeing the Glory of God", 14, 66, 69–70, 72–75, 79, 88, 176, 181, 200, 207
Seleucid(s), 5, 76, 87, 128, 129, 137–143, 154, 207, 211–213, 218, 219
Seleucid Era, 103, 104, 138–139n55, 141, 190, 203, 208, 210, 220, 241
Sennacherib, 134
Servant of YHWH (see Isaianic Servant)
Seth, Sethites, 28, 76, 78, 93, 94, 149, 151–154, 166
  Sethites and Cainites, Intermingling, 93, 94, 151
Settlement of the Land, 175, 176, 236
Shadow, 65, 215, 217, 218
Sheep (*see also* Lamb[s])
  singular, 31, 54, 60, 78, 85n1, 143, 158, 179, 209, 215, 218, 225
  plural , 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 19–21, 24, 25, 52–54, 62–67, 69–72, 76–83, 87, 91, 92, 94, 100, 103, 107, 108, 121, 138, 141, 150, 154, 158, 164, 166–171, 174–176, 178–182, 184–187, 190, 191, 195–196, 200, 201, 207–212, 214–220, 222, 224–225, 227–228, 242, 246, 250, 252–254
Sheepfold(s), 71, 187, 195, 196, 200, 246
Shem, 54, 76, 160, 163, 167
Shepherd(s) (angels), 1, 8–9, 11–12, 62, 83n, 100–103, 107–109, 131, 133, 143, 171, 185n77, 189–194, 195–196, 200–202, 208, 215, 217–218, 220–222, 224, 228, 236, 253
Sheshbazzar, 104, 199
Sight, Sightedness (*see* Eyes, Eyesight)
Sinai (*see* Mount Sinai)
Sirach, 97, 105, 236–238
Solomon, 27, 91, 95, 106, 180–182
Solomon's Temple (*see* Temple)
"Son of Man", 29–31, 45, 46, 48–51, 55, 96n, 157
Star(s), 1, 23, 52, 150–153, 155, 221, 222, 224
Straying and Returning/Remaining, 4, 7, 66, 71, 72, 77–81, 94, 173, 176, 180, 181, 186
Swifts, Swallows, 63, 64, 121, 122, 124, 163
Swine, 63, 64n, 121, 122, 124, 163
Sword(s), 62, 155, 156, 158, 187, 215, 217, 218, 225, 226, 248
Syria, Syrians, 91, 129, 130, 132, 134–136, 138, 139, 185, 198, 203, 205, 206, 214

Tabernacle, 59, 95, 158, 174, 177, 227
Tablets of Heaven, 42, 43, 45
Tax Farming, 205–207
Tcherikover, Victor, 88n110, 106n55, 203n30, 213–214, 238
Temple
  First Temple, 7, 27, 59, 79, 80, 89, 95, 98, 106, 131, 180–181, 184–186, 194, 236
  Heavenly Temple, 40n79, 157
  Second Temple, 3n4, 4, 5, 95–96, 103, 104n53, 172n55, 196–197, 199–200, 211–214, 220n66, 238–240, 246–247, 249
Testament (genre), 44–45
Thrace (*see* Anatolia)
Throne Vision(s), 29, 46, 51, 172n54
Tiglath-pileser, 91, 185, 188
"Tobiad Romance", 141n63, 204n33, 205–207
Tobias, Tobiads, 89, 135n45, 206
Torah (*see* Law)
Tower, 7, 71, 79, 80, 130, 131, 133, 155, 157, 177–181, 183, 185n76, 192, 195, 246–249

Unclean (*see* "Kosher Mentality)
Uriel, 43, 47, 51n119

Vultures, 122, 125, 137n50, 139n57, 201, 250n17, 251

War Scroll (1QM), 51n119, 107, 205, 218
Watcher(s), 8, 11, 37–42, 93, 94, 100, 135, 151–155, 222, 237
"Waters of Judgment", 41
White, Whiteness, 1, 36, 76–78, 82, 128, 148, 149, 150, 153, 166, 210, 227
White Bull (*see* Bull, Eschatological White)
Wilderness, 60, 66–70, 75, 87, 95, 173, 176, 227, 236
Wisdom, 235–238
Wolf/wolves, 64, 65, 70, 94, 121–123, 129, 130, 132–134, 142, 163, 165, 168–170, 183–184, 188

Zerubbabel, 103, 198, 199
Zobah, 136
Zoroastrianism, 103n50, 148–149, 162, 165